# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LEON CO JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER

District Name: Leon

Principal: Richard Richardson

SAC Chair: Charles Bagwell

Superintendent: Jackie Pons

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/1/2012



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)			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	Richard H. Richardson	B.S. M.S. Educational Leadership, Level II Certification		17	Assistant Principal of Ghazvini Learning Center in 2008-10: Grade: Ungraded The school is not eligible to be graded under the A+ Plan.
Principal	Wilfred Brown	B.S. M.S. Educational Leadership	1	1	Dean of Student at James S. Rickards High during the 2009-11 Grades: B – 2008 A – 2009
Principal	Michael McDaniel				

### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitt	ed				

### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1				

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

### Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed		% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
3	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	33.3%(1)	66.7%(2)	66.7%(2)	100.0%(3)	33.3%(1)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
No data submitted			

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

itle I, Part A	
itle I, Part C- Migrant	
itle I, Part D	
itle II	
itle III	
Title X- Homeless	
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)	
/iolence Prevention Programs	
<u> </u>	
Jutrition Programs	
Housing Programs	
lead Start	
Adult Education	
Career and Technical Education	
lob Training	
Other	
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)	
School-based MTSS/RtI Team-	
dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team.	

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other

vitn otner school teams to organize/coordinate wilss efforts?	
rescribe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement and implementation of the school improvement. Ian. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?	nt
MTSS I mplementation—	_
escribe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematicience, writing, and behavior.	cs,
describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.	
Describe the plan to support MTSS.	
iteracy Leadership Team (LLT)	_
School-Based Literacy Leadership Team————————————————————————————————————	—
dentify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).	
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).	
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?	
ublic School Choice Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment	
Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition	
escribe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs oplicable.	as
Grades 6-12 Only	
ec. 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.

*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 subjectly relevance to their future?	
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 subjections.	
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjectives.	
relevance to their ruture:	ects and
How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selection students' course of study is personally meaningful?	s, so that
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 Feedback Report	High Scho

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

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

2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		'	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the factorida Alternate Astudents scoring at or	ollowing group:		rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identii	fy and define areas in nee	
reading. Reading Goal #2b:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		<u> </u>	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		data, and refer	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identii	fy and define areas in need	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percenta gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	ige of students makir	ng learning				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:	
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	•	<u>'</u>	Submitted			

Based on the a	nalysis of s t for the fol	tudent achievem lowing group:	ent data, and	d refere	nce to "Gı	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and (	define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.									
Reading Goal	#3b:								
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-So	Iving Proces	ss to In	crease St	tudent Ach	ilevement		
Anticipated B	arrier	Strategy		Person Position Respons for Moniton	on Insible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	luation Tool
			No	Data Si	ubmitted				
Based on the a			ent data, and	d refere	nce to "Gı	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: P making learni		of students in l reading.	Lowest 25%						
Reading Goal	#4:								
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-So	Iving Proces	ss to In	crease St	tudent Ach	ilevement		
Anticipated B	arrier	Strategy		Person Position Respon for Monito	ion Determine Effectiveness		е	Evaluation Tool	
			No	Data Si	ubmitted				
Based on Ambi	tious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable	Objectiv	ves (AMOs	), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	erformance Target
5A. Ambitious k Measurable Obj school will redu by 50%.	jectives (AN	лОs). In six year	Reading Goz	al #					<u> </u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
					<b>—</b>				

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		lata, and refe	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
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 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi: Resp for	on or tion ponsible ttoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		lata, and refe	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
5C. English Language l satisfactory progress i		aking				
Reading Goal #5C:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi: Resp for	on or tion ponsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		lata, and refe	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress i		king				
Reading Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:		

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

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		a, and refer	ence to "Gı	uiding Questions", iden	itify and define areas in need	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:						
2012 Current Level of F		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted						

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

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

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

### Reading Budget:

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

l			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developmen	t		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	·	-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals \* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)). Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible Evaluation Tool Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in Englis	h at grade level in a	manner similar to non-E	ELL students.	
3. Students scoring pr	roficient in writing.			
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent	of Students Profici	ent in writing:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to Increase	Student Achievemen	t
		Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	

### CELLA Budget:

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

### **Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Strategy Responsible Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 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 Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Anticipated Barrier Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the a of improvemen			ent data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
3b. Florida Al	ternate As	sessment:						
Percentage of	fstudents	making Learning	g Gains in					
mathematics								
Mathematics	Goal #3b:							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Leve	el of Performaı	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	Increase St	tudent Ach	nievement		
				son or	Process l	Jsed to		
Anticipated B	Barrier	Strategy		tion oonsible	Determin		Eval	uation Tool
		3,	for		Effective Strategy			
			Mon	itoring	on aragy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on the a			ent data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and c	define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: F	Percentage	of students in L	owest 25%					
making learni	ing gains ir	n mathematics.						
Mathematics	Goal #4:							
Matrierriatics	σσαι <del>π 4</del> .							
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
			Pers	son or	Danasasi	1000 40		
				tion	Process l Determin			
Anticipated B	sarrier	Strategy	for	oonsible	Effective		Evai	uation Tool
			Mon	itoring	Strategy			
			No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambi	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ith Pe	erformance Target
			Elementary Scho	ol Mathemat	ics Goal #			
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob		ble Annual MOs). In six year						_
		hievement gap						
by 50%.			5A :			T		✓
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
	r	,	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 subgroup:

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

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

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, lowing subgroup:	and refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ince:
	Problem-Solving Pro	cess to Ir	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp			ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

### Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  Seased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in mathematics.  Anticipated Barrier Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement word 4 in mathematics.  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible Evaluation Tool  Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool  Anticipated Barrier Strategy Process to Increase Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool  Strategy Process Used to Evaluation Tool  Strategy Strategy Evaluation Tool  First Evaluation Tool  Firs	of improvement for the fo	llowing group:				
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process to Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Petermine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Peterm	1b. Florida Alternate As	ssessment:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Responsible Evaluation Tool Strate	Students scoring at Lev	els 4, 5, and 6 in matl	nematics.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible Information Increase Student Achievement  No Bata Submitted  No Bata Submitted  No Bata Submitted  No Bata Submitted  Strategy  No Bata Submitted  Strategy  No Bata Submitted  Determine Enfortiveness of Strategy  No Bata Submitted  Strategy  No Bata Submitted  Determine Information Increase Student Strategy  Person or Position Process to Increase Student Achievement  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Determine Entertwieness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Dat	Mathematics Goal #1b:					
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Performance:  Process Used to Performance:  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitte	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  Note that the following group:  No Data Submitted  No D						
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  Note that the following group:  No Data Submitted  No D						
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Problem-Solving at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Performance:  Process Used to Performance:  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitte		Problem-Solving	Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Sub			100033 to 1		Tadent Hernevernent	
Responsible frectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted					Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to Process Used to Person or Position Process Used to Process Used to	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
f improvement for the following group:  a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group:  1. Florida Alternate Assessment:  4. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:		_				
f improvement for the following group:  a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group:  b. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group:  a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement evel 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Paragon or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier  No Data Submitted  Acticipated Barrier Student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following group:  b. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in anathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  O12 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Donad on the second of	aki akan kan aki tari			udalia a Outstand III II II	for and define the
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Take on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need improvement for the following group:  10. Florida Alternate Assessment: tudents scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics.  Alathematics Goal #2b:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:			ia, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	ıy and define areas in need
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Taked on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group:  the Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in mathematics		chievement			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Evaluation Tool Strategy  Evaluation Tool Strategy  No Data Submitted  Evaluation Tool Strategy  Evaluati	Mathematics Goal #2a:					
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Rased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need if improvement for the following group:  1. Florida Alternate Assessment: 1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2012 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Assed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need fimprovement for the following group:  1. Florida Alternate Assessment:  1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  1. Mathematics Goal #2b:  1. O12 Current Level of Performance:  2. O13 Expected Level of Performance:						
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Assed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need fimprovement for the following group:  1. Florida Alternate Assessment:  1. Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  1. Mathematics Goal #2b:  1. O12 Current Level of Performance:  2. O13 Expected Level of Performance:						
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Strategy  Frocess Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Strategy  Evaluation Tool		Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Responsible for Strategy  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Evaluation Tool  Strategy  No Data Submitted  Responsible Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool					Process Used to	
No Data Submitted  Fased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group:  Students Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	onsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
dased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need in improvement for the following group:  ab. Florida Alternate Assessment: atudents scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group:  tb. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2012 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
f improvement for the following group:  tb. Florida Alternate Assessment: students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in nathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2012 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:  2012 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:			ta, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need
Mathematics Goal #2b:  2012 Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected Level of Performance:	2b. Florida Alternate As	ssessment:				
2013 Expected Level of Performance:	Students scoring at or a mathematics.	above Achievement Le	evel 7 in			
	Mathematics Goal #2b:					
Droblem Calving Decrease to Leaves a Charles LA	2012 Current Level of P	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
Droblem Calvin a December to Lance of Charles L.A. L.						
Droblem Calidre Decrease to Jacobs Charles 1.4.1.1						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		Problem-Solving F	Process to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	

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

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 s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, an lowing group:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expe	ected Level of Performar	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data S	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, a lowing group:	nd refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	, and define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.					
Mathematics Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I r	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Posi Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp			on or ion onsible coring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	N	No Data S	Submitted		

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

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

Mathematics Goal #4:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Person Posit Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsion Monit			ion Determine Effectiveness of		on Tool	
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambitious but A	Achievable Annual Mea	asurable Objec	tives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ath Perforn	nance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achiev Measurable Objectives (A school will reduce their a by 50%.	able Annual MOs). In six year	ddle School Ma	thematics G	Goal #			A
Baseline data 2010-2011 2011-20	12 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014	2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-20			2016-2017
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		data, and refe	rence to "Gi	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	areas in need
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress i	can Indian) not maki						
Mathematics Goal #5B	:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving	g Process to	I ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	son or ition ponsible itoring	Process l Determir Effective Strategy	ie	Evaluatio	on Tool
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of		data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	e areas in need
of improvement for the for 5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i	earners (ELL) not m	aking					
Mathematics Goal #50							

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person o Position Responsi for Monitorir		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	١		Submitted	1		
Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the fo	student achievement data, a	nd refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in nee	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	vilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	1	No Data :	Submitted			
of improvement for the fo	vantaged students not ma		ence to "G	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas in nee	
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	1	No Data :	Submitted			

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentage:	s, include the number of	students the p	percentage	represents next to the pe	ercentage (e.g., 70% (35)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate A	ssessment: Student	s scoring at			
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in r	mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #1	:				
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
		Pers	on or		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			Submitted		
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
		-			
<ol><li>Florida Alternate A or above Level 7 in m</li></ol>		s scoring at			
Mathematics Goal #2					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis on the analysis of the contract of the c	of student achievement t for the following grou	nt data, and r up:	eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3. Florida Alternate A making learning gain		of students			
Mathematics Goal #3					

2012 Current Level of	2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Incr	rease Stud	dent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			Evaluat	ion Tool	
	No	Data Sub	'				
Algebra End-of-Co	urse (EOC) Goals						
* When using percentages	s, include the number of studen	its the perd	centage rep	presents (e.g., 70% (35,	)).		
	of student achievement data,	and refe	rence to "(	Guiding Questions", ic	dentify an	d define areas ir	
of improvement for the  1. Students scoring a	following group: t Achievement Level 3 in A	Algebra					
Algebra Goal #1:	Themevernent Level 5 mm	ugebra.					
Aigebra Goar#1.							
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Level of Peri	formanc	e:	
	Droblem Colving Dro	20000 to 1	Inoropoo	Ctudent Aebievemen	n+		
	Problem-Solving Pro	JCESS 10 1	Ticlease ,	Student Achievemen			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	E	valuation Tool	
			Submitted				
		5 5 4 14					
Based on the analysis of improvement for the	of student achievement data, following group:	and refe	rence to "(	Guiding Questions", ic	dentify an	d define areas ir	
2. Students scoring a and 5 in Algebra.	t or above Achievement Le	evels 4					
Almahan Caal #2							
Algebra Goal #2:							
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ex	spected Level of Peri	formanc	e: 	
	Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Level of Peri	formanc	e: 	
	Performance:		2013 Ex	pected Level of Peri	formanc	9:	

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

Based on Ambitious but	Achievable Annual	Measurable (	Objectiv	ves (AMOs)	), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ith Performance Target
3A. Ambitious but Achie Measurable Objectives ( school will reduce their by 50%.	AMOs). In six year	Algebra Goa	l #				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	1-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of improvement for the f			d refere	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and define areas in nee
3B. Student subgroup: Hispanic, Asian, Ameri satisfactory progress Algebra Goal #3B:	ican Indian) not n						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:
	Problem-So	Iving Proces	ss to In	crease St	udent Ach	lievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy		Person Position Respon for Monito	on ensible	Process l Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evaluation Tool
		No	Data Si	ubmitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f			d refere	nce to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and define areas in nee
3C. English Language satisfactory progress		ot making					
Algebra Goal #3C:							
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performai	nce:
	Problem-So	Iving Proces	ss to In	crease St	udent Ach	ilevement	

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

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the following the followin		data, and refer	ence to "Gı	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	` ,	aking			
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in ne of improvement for the following subgroup:					ntify and define areas in need
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		

End of Algebra EOC Goals

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

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

in need of improve	ment	for the foll	owing group:						
1. Students scorii Geometry.	ng at	Achieven	nent Level 3 in						
Geometry Goal #	1:								
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performaı	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nanc	ce:
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement		
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Eva	aluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted				
Based on the analy in need of improve	sis of	student a	chievement data, owing group:	and r	reference to	"Guid	ing Questions", id	lentif	fy and define areas
2. Students scori 4 and 5 in Geome	_	or above	Achievement Le	vels					
Geometry Goal #	2:								
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performaı	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nanc	ce:
		Problem	-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent	Achievement		
Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Eva	aluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted				
Based on Ambitiou Target	s but	Achievable	Annual Measurab	ole Ob	ojectives (A	MOs), i	AMO-2, Reading a	and N	Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but . Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six year reduce their achiev 50%.	Obje r scho	ctives ol will	Geometry Goal #						<u></u>
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016		2016-2017

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

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

_ ,	s by ethnicity (white, Blad ican Indian) not making in Geometry	CK,				
Geometry Goal #3B:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	reference t	o "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas	
3C. English Language satisfactory progress	Learners (ELL) not making in Geometry.	g				
Geometry Goal #3C:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi <sup>s</sup> Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted			
	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	and r	reference t	o "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas	
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress	abilities (SWD) not making in Geometry.	9				
Geometry Goal #3D:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	tor	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

B 1 11 1 1	<u> </u>				1 115 1 1 5	
3	f student achievement data, for the following subgroup:	, and r	eference to	o "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas	
3E. Economically Disa	dvantaged students not					
making satisfactory p	rogress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3E:						
2012 Current Level of	2012 Current Level of Performance:			pected Level of Perform	mance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tool						
No Data Submitted						

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

### Mathematics 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	ient		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

areas in need of improv			l reference	to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.					
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of areas in need of improverse			l reference	to "Guiding Questions	", identify and define
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.					
Science Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

	of student achievement data rement for the following gro		reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define
2a. FCAT 2.0: Student	ts scoring at or above				
Achievement Level 4	in science.				
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
		Pers	on or		
		Posi	tion	Process Used to Determine	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp	onsible	Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
		Monitoring		Strategy	
No Data Submitted					

	of student achievement diversely to the following of		reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perf	ormance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	cess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

 $<sup>^* \</sup>textit{ When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., ~70\%) \\$ 

Based on the analysis areas in need of impro			d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
1. Florida Alternate <i>A</i> at Levels 4, 5, and 6		its scoring			
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
		Pers	son or		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	ition ponsible litoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis areas in need of impro			d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
2. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 in		its scoring			
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level o	of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving F	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
		Pers	son or	Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res <sub> </sub>	ition ponsible litoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
iology End-of-Co	urse (EOC) Goal	ls			
When using percentage	es, include the number o	of students th	ne percentag	ge represents (e.g., 70%	S (35)).
Based on the analysis areas in need of impro	of student achieveme vement for the followi	ent data, and ing group:	d reference	e to "Guiding Question:	s", identify and define
1. Students scoring a Biology.	at Achievement Leve	el 3 in			
Biology Goal #1:					

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

	of student achievement dar vement for the following gro		reference	to "Guiding Question	s", identify and define
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.					
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

### Writing 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 Developme	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

* When using percei	ntages,	include th	ne number of stude	nts the p	percentage	represents (e.g.,	70% (35)	).	
Based on the anal				a, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Ques	stions", id	entify a	nd define areas
1. Students scor	ing at	Achieve	ment Level 3 in	Civics.					
Civics Goal #1:									
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
		Proble	m-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	Student Achiev	ement		
Anticipated Barr	rier	Strateg	У	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evalua	tion Tool
			N	o Data	Submitted				
Based on the anal				a, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Ques	stions", id	entify a	nd define areas
2. Students scor 4 and 5 in Civics.	_	or abov	e Achievement L	evels					
Civics Goal #2:									
2012 Current Lev	vel of l	Performa	ance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Proble	m-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	Student Achiev	ement		
				Doro	00.05				
Anticipated Barr	anticipated Barrier Strategy		Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool		
			N		Submitted				
Professional Dev	-	nent (Pl	D) aligned with	Strate	egies thr	ough Profession	onal Lea	ırning (	Community
(PLC) or PD Acti Please note that ea	,	ategy doe	es not require a pr	ofessio	nal develo	opment or PLC ac	ctivity.		
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus		ade Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	Partio (e PLC,s grade	ep cipants .g. , ubject, level, or I-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strate Follo up/Mon	DW-	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

#### Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics 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 in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.  U.S. History Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	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:

<ul><li>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels</li><li>4 and 5 in U.S. History.</li></ul>					
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		rmance:
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy				Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

### U.S. History Budget:

Enthless the sead Decem			
Evidence-based Progr Strategy	am(s)/Material(s)  Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		*	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

### Attendance Goal(s)

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

Absences (10 or more)  Absences (10 or more)						
Attendance Goal #1:  2012 Current Attendance Rate:  2013 Expected Attendance Rate:  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		f attendance data, and refer	rence	to "Guidin	g Questions", identify a	and define areas in need
2012 Current Attendance Rate:  2013 Expected Attendance Rate:  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	1. Attendance					
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	Attendance Goal #1:					
Absences (10 or more)  Absences (10 or more)  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Current Attendance Rate:			2013 Exp	ected Attendance Ra	ate:
Absences (10 or more)  Absences (10 or more)  2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)						
Tardies (10 or more)  Tardies (10 or more)				2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		
Tardies (10 or more)  Tardies (10 or more)						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		of Students with Excessive	е	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
Problem-Solving Process to Encrease Student Achievement						
. Fobiem Solving Frocess to moreuse Student Aemevement		Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	tion oonsible	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted						

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

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

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

### Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based 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 Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	<u> </u>		Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

# Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Suspension				
Suspension Goal #1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			

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

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

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

#### Suspension Budget:

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

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

<sup>\*</sup> 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 area in need of improvement:				ntify and define areas	
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Go	oal #1:				
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:			2013 Expected Dropout Rate:		
2012 Current Graduati	on Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

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

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

### Dropout Prevention Budget:

m(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		Subtotal: \$0.00
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	No Data  Description of Resources	Description of Resources Funding Source  No Data  Description of Resources Funding Source

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

End of 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 in need of improvement:	f parent involvement data, a	and ref	ference to	"Guiding Questions", ide	ntify and define areas
1. Parent Involvement	t				
Parent Involvement Go	oal #1:				
*Please refer to the per participated in school ac unduplicated.	rcentage of parents who ctivities, duplicated or				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Parent	Involvement:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	Submitted		

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

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

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

#### Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Progr			A 11 1 1
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

### STEM 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 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, ident	ify and define area	as in ne	eed of improvement:			
1. CTE							
CTE Goal #1:							
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person Position Respon for Moniton	n Isible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data Suk	omitted				

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

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

### CTE Budget:

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 CTE Goal(s)

# 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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Dev	relopment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

### Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



Are you a reward school: † Yes † No

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

No Attachment

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

## AYP DATA

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

### SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found