

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Sara Abraham

SAC Chair: Kim Brady

Superintendent: Joseph Burke, Ed.D.

Date of School Board Approval: TBA

Last Modified on: 5/24/2013

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	Sara Abraham	B.S. Elementary Education M.Ed. Curriculum	2	20	10/11 GCHS A 09/10 GCS A AYP-No 08/09 SMCA A AYP-Yes 07/08 SMCA C AYP-No 06/07 BSCS A AYP-Yes
Principal	Patti Duffy	M.Ed./Ed. Leadership (All Levels), Social Science, (grades 6 - 12)	1	11	
Assis Principal	Amber Jensen	Master's Degree-- Ed leadership Bachelor's Degree--Elem Ed (K-6) Certification-- Educational Leadership Math (5-9) Elem Ed (1-6) National Board Certification-- Adolescent	5	2	10/11 GICS A 09/10 GCS A AYP - Yes

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Marie Eastwood	K-6 Elementary Education ESOL Endorsement K-12 Reading Endorsement	2	2	Works closely with teachers in grades K-12 to increase student performance in Reading.
ESE	Sidney Hayes	College of New Rochelle – B.A. Liberal Arts NOVA Southeastern University – Educational Leadership 36 Credits (pending FELE Exam)		4	2011-2012 Richard Milburn Academy F 2010- 2011 East Lee County HS C 2009-2010 East Lee County HS D 2008-2009 Cypress Lake HS A 2007-2008 Cypress Lake HS A 2006-2007 Richard Milburn Academy C 2005-2006 Richard Milburn Academy D

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	CSUSA Hiring Practice	CSUSA Human Resources Department and Principal	08/01/12	
2	TLC- program to allow for new teachers to be paired with a veteran teacher to mentor them throughout the year. This provides our new teachers the ability to have someone to provide support or advice for a variety of issues.	Amber Jensen	Ongoing during the school year.	
3	APPLES program- New teacher orientation program as required per the Department of Education	Amber Jensen	Ongoing during the school year.	
4	Staff Development meetings- In order to create a PLC at the school.	Amber Jensen Marie Eastwood	Ongoing during the school year.	
5	Support via classroom walkthroughs. This provides feedback to teachers and allows for conversations to be held with regards to improving instruction.	Amber Jensen	Ongoing during the 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 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	

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
41	17.1%(7)	41.5%(17)	22.0%(9)	9.8%(4)	22.0%(9)	97.6%(40)	4.9%(2)	2.4%(1)	7.3%(3)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amber Jensen	New Teachers	Teacher Learning Community Supervisor	New Teacher Support Activities

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Sara Abraham, Principal
Amber Jensen, Assistant Principal
Jon Angelus, RtI
Marie Eastwood, Reading Coach K-12

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 GCHS RtI Leadership Team developed a plan over the summer of 2012 to meet the needs of the GCHS students. The team reviewed data from the Spring 10 FCATs and developed a year long plan to improve learning in reading and math. The team will meet monthly to review the progress on the year long plan. The administrative team will conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs to monitor teacher instruction and commitment to the plan.

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 RTI Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems. Each administrator has been given a specific content area to oversee. The administrator is working with the teachers in each of the core areas to oversee the progress during the year and to work with the teachers in using the data to work on specific areas to help their students to improve their math and reading learning and raise their FCAT scores.

MTSS Implementation

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

GCHS uses the CSUSA benchmark testing system. Students are tested three times per year, once each quarter, in the areas of reading and math. These tests were developed to be similar to the Florida FCAT tests. The data from the tests is broken down in to the strands for each area and is available on the Student Information System (SIS). For example, reading is broken down into "Main Idea, Plot and Purpose" as well as the other three strands. Teachers have available to them, at all times, the percentage that the students got right in each of the strand areas. In addition, all of their FCATs are also broken down into each of the strands and the percentage correct in each area. Teachers also have access to the overall score of the FCAT tests the student has taken.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff had a preschool training on the response to RtI in August of 2012. Teachers reviewed how the FCAT is used and what it tests. The teachers had training on how to use the SIS system to access the Benchmark and FCAT data analysis. Each teacher will be tracking all of the Level 1 and 2 students in reading and in math. Each teacher has set class goals and all level 1 and 2 students have set individual goals in reading and in math.

Lee County has also developed a support plan for each of the schools in Correct I. The team will provide any training, coaching, or guidance to help our school implement our plan

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Sara Abraham, Principal
Amber Jensen, Assistant Principal
Denene Jones, Media Center
Brian Kopp, LA Department Head
Marie Eastwood, Secondary Reading Coach
Patti Duffy, Principal of Curriculum

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

The GCHS School Leadership team meets every week throughout the school year. The LLT is a sub-group of the Leadership team and meets bimonthly. The Curriculum Coordinator is leader of the LLT meetings. Her role is to ensure that the goals of the literacy team are being met throughout the high school. The meetings consist of discussion of, implementation of, and evaluation of literacy-based initiatives at the school.

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

GCHS has implemented a major new reading initiative for all students and staff. The goal of the initiative is to get students to read and become lifelong readers. The school is participating in the CSUSA Reading Challenge. This is a weekly program in which students are required to read silently for an extended period of time. The annual goal is for all high school students to read 15 books per year. Students complete a "Reading some great books at GCHS!" form when they have completed each book. Each student's progress is monitored by their Reading/LA teacher.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

We, GCHS, embrace the philosophy that teaching reading strategies and practices are the responsibility of every teacher. Our Instructional Focus Program is a cross-curricular approach designed to integrate the reading strands into the global

Curriculum of the school, emphasizing short, standard-based lessons. We believe in embracing the value of reading across every curriculum, since reading is in everything we do

Content area teachers and elective teachers work together to have students read in the content area and answering FCAT type questions regarding these readings. These readings are part of the Instructional Focus Calendar.

GCHS instituted a vocabulary program for all subject areas three years ago. Each subject area has an academic word list that pertains to their teaching area. These words are used as "word of the week" and/or "word of the day" in the various departments according to the instructional focus calendar.

*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?

All GCHS teachers are required to start each of their classes with "bellringers". The daily bellringers are a series of questions and/or scenarios developed by each department annually. These bellringers are specifically designed to show the relevance between what students are learning and how it relates to their everyday life and their future. For example, all students in science courses have the same bellringer on the same day. In addition, all applied and integrated courses have curriculum maps which requires teachers to focus on real life connections to their subject matter.

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?

GCHS students develop a four year academic and career plan during their freshmen year with the assistance and advice of the guidance department. This four year plan is updated annually. The GCHS Program of Studies has suggested course selections for various career paths. This pathway helps students and their parents to determine what courses to take each year. The guidance department is very involved with college and career planning, hosting separate junior and senior seminars during the school year. These seminars focus on the student's course of study during their high school years that will enable them to meet their postsecondary plans.

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](#)

The GCHS Guidance counselors meet with individual students to review and revise their four year academic and career plan due to the fact that student interests change over their high school career. Student files are kept that include student FCAT grades, transcripts, ACT and SAT grades, and any other pertinent information. Using the students goals and current performance, guidance helps the student to determine what they need to do to be ready for their postsecondary plans. In addition, guidance meets with each senior and develops a "senior contract" which outlines exactly what the student needs to complete during their senior year to meet the goals of their four year plan.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In the 2012-2013 school year the GCHS students will improve in reading from 50% to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 9 Reading Proficiency: 56% and, Grade 10 Reading Proficiency: 41%	The Grade 9 Reading Proficiency goal is 62% and the Grade 10 Reading Proficiency goal is 47%.

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 has limited or poor reading strategy skills	Teach reading strategies and evaluate	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Reading teacher, Classroom teacher	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program	FAIR Assessment and Benchmark Reading 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading 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				

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of GCHS students performing above proficiency will be 30% of 9th and 10th grade students.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
The percentage of students achieving above proficiency for grade 9 was 17% and for grade 10, 20%.			The goals for achieving above proficiency in reading for both grade 9 and 10 is 30%.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	High Level Questioning	Encourage participation and provide support for performance in Cambridge and critical thinking class.	Administrator, Department chair	Evaluation of teacher grade books, practice tests	Enrollment and performance in course work.
2	Integration of reading in the content areas.	Real world learning activities in the elective courses	Administrator, Dept Chair	Observational walkthroughs.	FCAT Performance
3	Students with limited reading strategy skills.	Improve student reading strategy skills.	Classroom teachers	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Reading Goal #2b:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3a:

In the 2012-2013 school year, GCHS students making learning gains will increase from 56% to 60%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance of students making learning gains is 56%.	In 2012, 9th and 10th grade students that will make learning gains in reading is 60%.

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	Students with limited reading strategy skills	Improve student reading strategy skills.	Classroom teachers	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing program	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Tests
2	Students with limited or poor reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading Teachers, and Classroom Teachers	Progress on FAIR Reading Assessment and the CSUSA Benchmark Reading Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with limited reading strategy skills.	Improve student reading strategy skills.	Classroom teachers	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing program	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of the lowest 25% GCHS students making learning gains will increase from 52% to 60%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current performance level of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading is 52%.	In 2012, both 9th and 10th grade students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will be 60%.

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	Students with limited reading strategy skills.	Improve student reading strategy skills.	classroom teachers	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing program	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Tests
	Students have limited or	Improve reading strategy	Asst. Principal of	Progress will be	FAIR Reading

2	poor reading strategy skills.	skills.	Curriculum, Reading Teachers, Classroom Teachers	monitored by FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Testing Program.	Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark tests.
---	-------------------------------	---------	--	---	---

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>			
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60	63	67	71	74	

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of Hispanic students making adequate yearly progress will increase from 41% to 51%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in Reading is 41%.	The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in reading will increase from 41%-51%.

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	Students with limited or low reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading Teachers, Classroom Teachers, ESOL contact	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Program.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will increase from 23% to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011-2012 percentage of 23% of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading goal was not met.	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year our goal is to bring the percentage up to 32% of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with limited English proficiency in reading and writing in English.	Students will attend tutoring sessions after school with teachers. Students will also receive differentiated instruction in classes based on their ESOL needs.	Classroom teacher Reading coach ESOL representative	Analysis of FCAT results, classroom tests and quizzes and Benchmark testing.	FCAT results Classroom tests and quizzes Benchmark testing

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress will increase from 37% to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Economically Disadvantaged students currently have 37% scoring at or above grade level in reading.	The Economically Disadvantaged students will increase in reading at or above grade level from 37% to 47%.

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	Students with limited or poor reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading teaches and classroom teachers.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading 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 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
Literary Leadership Team	Grades 9-12	Amber Jensen Marie Eastwood	School-wide	Ongoing throughout school year.	Analyze assessment data	Department Heads

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To improve reading scores on state tests required to pass for graduation.	Edge is a core Reading/Language Arts program designed for students reading below grade level. It prepares students for success on exit exams and moves them to graduation.		\$2,189.94
			Subtotal: \$2,189.94
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,189.94

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:	For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 9th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for listening and speaking will increase from 70% to 73%. For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 10th - 12th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for listening and speaking will increase from 88% to 90%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Number is not available at this time.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 9th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for reading will increase from 70% to 73%.

For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 10th - 12th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for writing will increase from 88% to 90%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Number is not available at this time.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 9th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for writing will increase from 70% to 73%.

For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of 10th - 12th grade students meeting proficiency in CELLA level for writing will increase from 88% to 90%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Number is not available at this time.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of 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:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3:

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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="55"/>	<input type="text" value="59"/>	<input type="text" value="63"/>	<input type="text" value="67"/>	<input type="text" value="71"/>	<input type="text"/>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:					
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:			For the school year 2012-2013 students meeting proficiency on the Algebra EOC will increase from 51% to 55%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
For the 2011-2012 school year students scoring a level 3 or 4 on the Algebra EOC were 51%.			Student proficiency in the Algebra EOC test will increase from 51% to 55%.		
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	Students with limited or poor Algebra skills.	All 9th and 10th grade students will take the CSUSA Algebra Benchmark test 3 times per year.	AP of Curriculum Math Dept Chair Classroom Algebra Teachers	Analysis of CSUSA Benchmark Algebra testing program	CSUSA Benchmark Algebra test

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.	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of ELL students who were proficient in Algebra will increase from 25% to 30%.
Mathematics Goal #5C:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
For the 2011-2012 school year, the ELL students that were proficient in the Algebra EOC were 25%.			The ELL students will increase in proficiency in Algebra from 25% to 30%.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with limited or poor Algebra skills.	Improve Algebra skills and knowledge using practice problems, tutoring and CSUSA Algebra Benchmark program.	AP of curriculum, Math Dept Head and Classroom Algebra teachers	Data analysis of Algebra tests and CSUSA benchmark testing	CSUSA Benchmark Testing

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:			In the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students with disabilities who were proficient in Algebra will increase from 13% to 16%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
For the 2011-2012 school year, the students with disabilities that were proficient in the Algebra EOC were 13%.			The students with disabilities will increase proficiency from 13% to 16%.		
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	Students with limited or poor Algebra skills.	Improve Algebra skills and knowledge using practice problems, tutoring and CSUSA Algebra Benchmark program.	AP of curriculum, Math Dept Head and Classroom Algebra teachers	Data analysis of Algebra tests and CSUSA benchmark testing	CSUSA Benchmark Testing

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.			In the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase from 45% to 50%.		
Mathematics Goal E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage to students making satisfactory progress in Algebra was 45%.			The economically disadvantaged students will increase proficiency from 45% to 50%.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students with limited or	Improve Algebra skills and	AP of curriculum,	Data analysis of Algebra	CSUSA Benchmark

1	poor Algebra skills.	knowledge using practice problems, tutoring and CSUSA Algebra Benchmark program.	Math Dept Head and Classroom Algebra teachers	tests and CSUSA benchmark testing	Testing
---	----------------------	--	---	-----------------------------------	---------

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	For the 2012-2013 school year the percentage of students meeting proficiency in Algebra EOC will increase to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student proficiency is based on EOC scores of 3 or higher for the 2012 school year. Of the students that took the exam, 51% were proficient.	Proficiency in Algebra will increase to 55% during the 2012-2013 school year.

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 has limited or poor Algebra skills.	Teach algebra strategies and evaluate students progress.	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Math Dept Head and classroom teachers	CSUSA Algebra Benchmark testing	EOC and CSUSA Benchmark Algebra test
2	Students with limited or poor math skills.	All grade 9 and all students will take the CSUSA Math Benchmark 3 times per year.	AP of Curriculum, Math Dept Chair, Math Teachers	Analysis of CSUSA Math Benchmark Testing Program	CSUSA Math Benchmark 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 Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	For the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students meeting proficiency in Algebra will increase from 51% to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student proficiency is based on EOC scores of 4 or higher for the 2011-2012 school year. Of those that took the exam 51% were proficient on the Algebra exam.	Proficiency in Algebra will increase from 51% to 55% in the 2012-2013 school year.

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	Students with limited or poor Algebra skills.	All Algebra I students will take the CSUSA Algebra Benchmark test three times per year.	Classroom teacher Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Dept Head	Analysis of CSUSA Algebra Benchmark Testing Program.	CSUSA Algebra Benchmark testing

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:			For the 2012-2013 school year the percentage of students meeting proficiency in Geometry EOC will increase to 55%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Student proficiency is based on EOC scores of 3 for the 2012 school year. Of the students that took the exam, 51% were proficient.			Proficiency in Geometry will increase to 55% during the 2012-2013 school year.		
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 has limited or poor Geometry skills.	Teach geometry strategies and evaluate students progress.	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Math Dept Head and classroom teachers	CSUSA Geometry Benchmark testing	EOC and CSUSA Benchmark Geometry test
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:			For the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students meeting proficiency in Geometry will increase from 51% to 55%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Student proficiency is based on EOC scores of 3 for the 2011-2012 school year. Of those that took the exam 51% were proficient on the Algebra exam.			Proficiency in Geometry will increase from 51% to 55% in the 2012-2013 school year.		
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	Students with limited or poor Geometry skills.	Improve Geometry skills and knowledge using practice problems, tutoring and CSUSA Algebra Benchmark program.	AP of curriculum, Math Dept Head and Classroom Geometry teachers	Data analysis of Geometry tests and CSUSA benchmark testing	CSUSA Benchmark Testing

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
Math Cohort	Grades 9-12	Erica Miller, Dept Head	Math Teachers	Ongoing through May 2013	Math Benchmarks Data Analysis	Erica Miller Math Teachers

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To improve test scores on EOC exams and prepare students for college.	Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II and pre-Calculus books.		\$50,243.20
Subtotal: \$50,243.20			
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: \$50,243.20			

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.	
Science Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving 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				

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:			For the 2012-2013 school year, students will increase from 42% to 46% in science proficiency.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Students achieved 42% proficiency in science.			Students will improve proficiency from 42%-46% in science. 68% of 9th grade students taking Biology EOC will meet or exceed proficiency(level 3 or above).		
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	Students with limited knowledge of science.	Increase science knowledge by use of classroom bell-ringer problems that mimic the EOC problems.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Science Dept. Chair, Science Teachers	CSUSA Science Benchmark Testing Program.	CSUSA Benchmark Science 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 Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:			In the 2012-2013 school year 57% of students taking the Biology 1 EOC will meet or exceed the district average as measured by the FL DOE report.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Currently we have 54% of students who met or exceed the district average on the Biology 1 EOC.			In the 2012-2013 school year 57% of students taking the Biology 1 EOC will meet or exceed the district average as measured by the FL DOE report.		
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	Students with limited science knowledge	Use of Biology EOC practice problems and CSUSA benchmark testing	Assistant Principal, Maricel Knapczyk, Dept Head, Science Teachers	Analysis of practice problems, class/unit tests, CSUSA benchmark tests	CSUSA Benchmark testing, EOC testing

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

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

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

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To improve students test scores on EOC exams and college readiness.	Biology books.		\$25,529.25
			Subtotal: \$25,529.25
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: \$25,529.25

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:	For the 2012-2013 school year, sophomores will increase in writing proficiency from 83% to 87% proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Sophomores achieved 83% Writing Proficiency.	Sophomores will increase Writing Proficiency from 83% to 87%.

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	Students with poor writing skills.	Improve writing skills in 9th through 12th grade students using grammar and writing drills daily.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Language Arts Teachers and all Classroom Teachers.	Analysis of writing prompt data for individual students by English teachers.	Writing Prompt data from individual students.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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
Writing in each subject area (to include PE, Music, Art)	Grade 9-12	Reading coach Dept. Heads Classroom Teachers AP	Writing across the curriculum,	Ongoing through May 2013	Evidence of student work, projects in classroom	Classroom teacher AP Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance					
Attendance Goal #1:		In the 2012-2013 school year the GCHS students will improve attendance by 1%.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
The current rate of attendance at GCHS is 96.46% as of September 2012.		Statistically, the attendance rate at GCHS is good. The rate of attendance for 2012-2013 will improve by 1%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
Currently less than 1% of students attending GCHS have excessive absences.		The number of students with excessive absences will improve through the 2012-2013 school year.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
Currently there are less than 1% of students attending GCHS that have excessive Tardies to school.		The number of students with excessive tardies will improve.			
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	Transportation. GCHS students come from all over the county.	Analyze bus routes to see if travel time can be reduced and that buses are full.	Patricia Penteado	Analysis of Data.	Bus routes and bus attendance rates.
2	Traffic during Parent Drop off at GCHS.	Analyzing the flow of traffic to see if the procedure can be more effective.	Administration, teachers with morning duties, and security.	Data analysis of attendance.	SIS attendance rates.
	Students with	Form Attendance Focus	Office Staff,	Focus group will	Number of

3	Excessive Absences (10 or more)	Group to identify problems and form solutions to reduce excessive absences	Registrar	evaluate effectiveness	students with excessive absences will decline
4	Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	Form Attendance Focus Group to identify problems and form solutions to reduce excessive tardies	Office Staff, Registrar	Focus group will evaluate effectiveness	Number of students with excessive tardies will decline

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension			In the 2012-2013 school year, the number of GCHS suspensions and in-school suspensions will decrease.		
Suspension Goal #1:					
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions			2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions		
For the 2012-2013 school year we have implemented Griffin cards and after school detentions in place of in-school suspensions.			For the 2012-2013 school year we have implemented Griffin cards and after school detentions in place of in-school suspensions.		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School			2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School		
There were 1330 instances of ISS in 2010-2011 school year. These ranged from one class period to entire day served.			For the 2012-2013 school year we have implemented Griffin cards and after school detentions in place of in-school suspensions.		
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		
There were 134 out-of-school suspensions.			The number of out-of-school suspensions will be reduced by 50%.		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		
To be determined.			The number of individual students suspended out of school will be reduced.		
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	Students that do not follow rules and regulations.	Increase student recognition and understanding of rules and regulations.	AP of Discipline, Dean of Students	Analysis of 10/11 data.	District reports of student discipline issues.

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
Policies and Procedures	9-12	Jerome Kukurugya, Sara Abraham, Amber Jensen	school-wide	Professional Development days and through faculty meetings	Analyzing referrals, SIS data analysis for tracking behavior	Jerome Kukurugya, Sara Abraham, Amber Jensen

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:			In the 2012-2013 school year the number of GCHS students who drop out of school will be reduced by 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:		
The current dropout rate for 2010-2011 is not available from the district. Traditionally, GCHS has a low drop out rate.			The drop out rate will decrease in 2013-2013.		
2012 Current Graduation Rate:			2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
The current graduation rate is not available from the district. (In 08/09, the graduation rate was 93%.)			The graduation rate will increase by 2%.		
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	Students not meeting the credit and/or the GPA criteria needed for graduation.	Students develop a 4 year plan with guidance that is monitored by their guidance counselor. Seniors also develop a senior contract.	Guidance counselors.	Analysis of data.	GCHS 4 year plan and senior contract.

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
Guidance Cohort	9-12	Elizabeth Corrente	Guidance Counselors	Ongoing through May 2013	Analysis of 4 year plans and senior contracts	Guidance counselors

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Increase parent participation in performing parent volunteer hours at GCHS from 6000 to 7500 thereby increasing parent involvement in the school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

Parents are required to perform 20 hours of volunteer work for GCHS per school year. Last year, parents performed a total of 6000 volunteer hours.			Increase the amount of parents performing their GCHS school volunteer hours to achieve a total of 7500 hours.		
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	Parents not performing or keeping track of contact volunteer hours.	Send quarterly reminder reports of current volunteer hour status and volunteer opportunities.	Administrative Assistant	Maintaining parent volunteer hours log on line.	Student Information System-Volunteer Hours Tab.

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
SIS Training on Tracking Parent volunteer hours	9-12	Admin assistant	office staff	ongoing through May 2013	Quarterly analysis of parent volunteer hours	office manager

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			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
1	Students with limited knowledge of science, technology, engineering and math.	CSUSA Benchmark testing	Classroom teachers in math, science and technology, reading specialist	Unit tests and quizzes, CSUSA Benchmark testing, hands-on inquiry based labs	CSUSA Benchmark tests, EOC and 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 Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

STEM Budget:

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

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:				
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						

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of 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
Reading	To improve reading scores on state tests required to pass for graduation.	Edge is a core Reading/Language Arts program designed for students reading below grade level. It prepares students for success on exit exams and moves them to graduation.		\$2,189.94
Mathematics	To improve test scores on EOC exams and prepare students for college.	Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II and pre-Calculus books.		\$50,243.20
Science	To improve students test scores on EOC exams and college readiness.	Biology books.		\$25,529.25
				Subtotal: \$77,962.39
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$77,962.39

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☒ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The School Advisory Council will meet regularly. The goal of the SAC is that all students will receive a quality education. The SAC will assist in the development and evaluation of the school improvement plan (SIP). The SAC will review relevant data (FCAT scores and benchmark scores), identify areas that need improvement, help develop strategies to facilitate school improvement, and monitor the progress made toward improvement. The SAC will also assist the principal with the annual school budget.

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

Lee School District GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	48%	82%	83%	42%	255	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	56%	80%			136	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	52% (YES)	63% (YES)			115	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					516	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	50%	77%	84%	33%	244	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	51%	79%			130	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	47% (NO)	67% (YES)			114	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					498	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested