FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GRACEVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Jackson

Principal: Chris Franklin

SAC Chair: Kathaleen Nolin

Superintendent: Lee Miller

Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012



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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Chris Franklin | BS-Agriculture Education Master of Science- Educational Leadership Specialist-School Principal | 7.5 | 7.5 | 2011-2012 No grade yet 2010-2011 Grade B No AYP 2009-2010 Grade A No AYP 2008-2009 Grade A No AYP |
| Assis Principal | Julie Burdeshaw | BA-Social Studies Education, University of Florida Master of Science- Educational Leadership, University of West Florida Specialist- Curriculum, University of West Florida | 23 | 5 | 2011-2012 No grade yet 2010-2011 Grade B 2009-2010 Grade A No AYP 2008-2009 Grade A No AYP |

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) |
|--------------|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | | | Graceville High School has no instructional coaches due to budget constraints. |

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 | Regular grade level/subject area faculty/staff meetings Mentor/Mentee partnerships Current employees make recommendations/referrals Implementation of the Jackson County New Teacher Program Individual Professional Development Plan Administrative walk-throughs | Principal, Chris Franklin AP, Julie Burdeshaw | 1. on going 2. on going 3. on going 4. June 2013 5. June 2013 6. June 2013 | |
| 2 | 1. Recruit- Jackson County works with Chipola College to recruit newly graduated teachers. Jackson County is also a partner with the Panhandle Area Education Consortium that advertises job openings for the district that is accessible on the World Wide Web. | Deputy Superintendent- Larry Moore; Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-Chris Franklin | | |
| 3 | Retain- Newly hired teachers are provided a mentor and district support through the beginning teacher program. | Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-Chris Franklin | July 2012- June-2013 | |
| 4 | 3. Retain- Professional development opportunities through the coordination of local, state, and federal funds sources to increase teacher effectiveness and retain qualified teachers by providing a conducive environment for improving professional knowledge. | Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-Chris Franklin ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs | July 2012-June 2013 | |
| 5 | 4. Retain- provide resources (tutoring for subject area exams, reimbursement for reading endorsement, reimbursement for college courses, etc.) for teachers to obtain their professional teaching certificate; become highly- qualified in subject areas taught; and renewal of professional certificates for veteran teachers. | | July 2012-June 2013 | |
| 6 | 5. Retain- Support teachers to improve instructional practices through the evaluation process developed through Race to the Top using the Marzano Frameworks. | Director of Elementary Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Teacher Evaluation Manager- Don Wilson; Principal-Chris Franklin | September 2012-June 2013 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|--|
| 1. Instructional staff teaching out of field: 5/26 (19%) | 1. Teachers are working towards certification in their respective classes and content area. |
| 2. Less than effective rating 1/26 (4%) | 2. 90 day improvement plan implemented and teacher transferred |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 26 | 3.8%(1) | 23.1%(6) | 34.6%(9) | 38.5%(10) | 46.2%(12) | 100.0%(26) | 23.1%(6) | 0.0%(0) | 19.2%(5) |

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 |
|-------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Amity Britt | Levester Ramsey | Mr. Ramsey has been assigned Social Studies classes and Business Technology classes to teach. Mrs. Britt has 6 years of experience teaching Social Studies. Mrs. Britt has demonstrated superior classroom instruction with multiple differentiated interventions over MS and HS curriculum. | Jackson County Beginning Teacher Program |
| | | | |
| | | Mrs. Schneider is teaching 3 classes of band. Mrs. Long is experienced in music and | |

| Alexandria Schneider | productions. She has 21 years teaching experience. Mrs. Long created our show choir program and has demonstrated success since its inception. | Jackson County Beginning Teacher Program |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |

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

| We are not a Title I school | |
|---|--|
| 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 (Rtl)

School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Instructional Leader: Chris Franklin Team Leader, Data Mentor, Record Keeper: Julie Burdeshaw Content Specialist: Judy Cox Staff Liason: Nancianne Watson Behavior specialist: Richard Wheatley SLP: Richard Wheatlely

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 Student Support Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?

The team will plan to meet regularly to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link the data to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, and make decisions. The team will function as a support and resource for the classroom teachers as they carry out the responsibility for educating each student.

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?

Members of the Student Support Team met with the School Improvement Committee to help develop the SIP. The members provided information needed to align processes and procedures regarding RtI and the SIP.

MTSS Implementation-

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

Baseline data: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)-Level 1 and 2, Jackson Writes, Thinklink, Behavior Tracking Charts (BTC) -an inhouse tracking system of student behavior used to monitor daily/weekly behavior improvements, Functioning Behavior Assessment (FBA), and Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP)

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jackson Writes, Thinklink, Behavior Tracking Charts (BTC), Functioning Behavior Assessment (FBA), and Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), Discipline Referrals, Report Cards

End of Year: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Jackson Writes, Thinklink, Behavior Tracking Charts (BTC), Functioning Behavior Assessment (FBA), Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), FCAT, Report Cards

T1, T2, T3

PMRN/FAIR reports (reading), ThinkLinklink (math), Performance Matters (reading, math, science, writing, discipline) Pinnacle (reading, math, science), District Writing, Office Discipline Referrals/TERMS

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Staff Liaison on the SST will continue to collaborate with grade groups on the PS/RtI process. District PS/RtI Coordinator will continue to provide training and consultation with the school-based SST throughout the school year. New teachers will receive training on the PS/RtI process as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS is supported at our school with the help of district coordinator Tracy Stephens. Inservice is provided periodically to address new processes, interventions, requirements, etc. All schools in the district meet to share ideas. Each summer the data team along with RtI members access the RtI program at our school and make changes if needed.

MTSS will be supported through district wide trainings, as well as onsite trainings and consultation, and through collaboration with all other school-based teams focusing to improve student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team—

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

Principal-Chris Franklin Asst. Principal-Julie Burdeshaw ESE Specialist-Richard Wheatley Technology Coordinator-Joshua Graham Guidance-Rita Jones Reading Teachers-Amy Miller, Judy Cox, Phillip Jones, Nancianne Watson, Danny Kincaid, Jeff Edge, Wilson Ivey, JaJuan Clark

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

The team implements the Jackson District Reading Plan into the school curriculum. GHS has developed a reading plan as well. Components of this plan are Accelerated Reader, disaggregating Fair, Classworks data for Reading Level 1 and 2 students and Thinklink data, differentiated curriculum, and vertical alignment of reading curriculum. The team meets as needed and dialogue is on going between reading teachers and other content area teachers.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year is expose students to increased AP reading material, both in reading classes and other content area classes. Accelerated Reader will continue to be used to encourage personal reading. An end of the year field trip is sponsored to reward readers who have achieved the targeted number of points.

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.

We are not a Title I school.

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.

All teachers in every class and content area will develop a curriculum that implements reading assignments and strategies for their specific content area. The 12 Powerful Words, Fair Assessements and/or word walls will be a part our curriculum. Reading teachers will take the lead in making suggestions for assignments and maintain dialogue with all teachers over this plan. AP reading material will be encouraged at all levels even if the teacher has to read it to the students at lower grade levels.

*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?

Students are given an opportunity to select a theme/major in high school. Although the choices are limited, (due to budget constraints i.e. not enough staff to man classes), students are able to streamline some classes to their interests. Advanced placement classes are available in grades 9-12. Vocational programs, Agriculture and Computer Classes, Career and Technical Education and STEM courses are offered, as well. Students are encouraged by all faculty to take the CPT(College Prepratory Testing) and ACT prep classes to improve their testing confidence and scores. Business representatives from the community speak to students about applying academics and work ethic to the workforce. Experiments in science classes, research projects, hands-on discovery learning activities, and cooperative group activities relate studies to the student's college or workforce goals.

GHS uses curriculum and teaching methods that help connect academic and vocational learning. The integration of academic and vocational concepts blend concepts in Math, Science, English and History classes with vocational skills in areas of agriculture and business. Vocational classes incorporate rigorous applied academic concepts and problem solving skills, as well as, emphasize higher order analytical skills. Academic classes integrate tasks and assignments that have a post-secondary college/career focus.

In the vocational department, students can earn a Certificate for Agriculture Technician through the biotechnology classes available. AP classes in Psychology, American History, American Government, and Literature and Composition. Our goal is to add more AP classes each year.

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?

Students meet with the school guidance counselor and a career specialist by grade level 8 to discuss academic planning. Students are given the opportunity to select the courses and curriculum track they would like to enroll in for the coming year. Each student's course selection is reviewed by guidance staff and students are placed in the appropriate classes. All 8th grade students must take a semester career planning course. The students will use CHOICES for exploration of careeer options and skills. This prepares the student for their high school course selections. All students in grades 8th through 12th will have a career education plan based on their individual goals and interests towards high school graduation. This plan must be reviewed and updated by students at least once a year. This past summer 2012 guidance met with upcoming 9th graders and parents to discuss graduation requirements and options. All upcoming 12th graders and parents met with guidance as well to discuss graduation on track requirements and scholarship information. The guidance department hosts a Senior Night with seniors and parents prior their senior year to review and discuss scholarship information. This includes scholarships online, community and business scholarships, and the Bright Future Scholarship. Students are encouraged to make early and continuing college goals and are mentored and encouraged through grades 6-12. Richie Wheatley, ESE teacher, coordinates a community based mentorship program that targets at risk students who may have trouble earning a regular diploma. Students will be encouraged to set goals for their future attending college. Career shadowing is offered to high school students at various times during the year.

College and military recruiters visit the school to give out information to students and answer any questions. Seniors attend a career fair and senior day at Chipola College and the Baptist College of Florida.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

GHS offers AP classes in American English, American History, and Calculus. We also offer year long classes to help students improve ACT and SAT scores.

The guidance department hosts a College and Career night open to grades 6-12 students and their parents to review and discuss middle and high school educational plans, goals and scholarship information. This includes scholarships on-line, community and business scholarships, and the Bright Future Scholarship (Gold Seal). Colleges and vocational schools from the greater surrounding area (about 12) are available for questions and give information. Military recruiters are invited as well and visit several times during the year. Seniors attend a career fair and senior day Chipola College and the Baptist College of Florida. Executive Interships are available to students who want hands-on experience in a business or field of their choice. These interships allow students to use part of their school day to work off campus and receive a grade for their participation in that line of work. DCT is offered in the same manner except a student may get paid for the work. Career shadowing is offered to high school students at various times during the year.

Glenda Hartzog, Career Specialist at Graceville High School, coordinates a community based mentorship program that targets at risk students. These students will be encouraged to set goals for their future attending college. Career shadowing is offered to high school students at various times during the year. College and military recruiters visit the school through out the school year to give out information to students and answer any questions.

Over 20 major colleges are posted in student halls with Bachelor of Science/Arts Degrees posted per college to help students tie in the relevance of their middle/high school education to post secondary education.

At the extra-curricular level, strides are made at the onset of 6th grade and continue through the 12 grade to involve every student in some type of extra-curricular activity. Involvemment and participation in clubs, athletics, band, show choir, state and local contests give students opportunities to make decisions, offer community service and perform in real world, meaningful situations.

In addition to the usual data disaggregation on FCAT scores, every teacher on staff monitors the data wall located in the office and uses Performance Matters data program to track and stay abreast student progress.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| readi | CAT2.0: Students scoring ng. ing Goal #1a: | g at Achievement Level 3 | | will achieve proficiency (FC | CAT Level 3) on |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| 35%(| 70/200) | | 42% (84/200) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | Fluency: Students struggle through reading passages losing comprehension along the way. | Fluency testing in reading classes Differentiated instruction FCAT chats 12 Powerful Words AR program After school tutoring Students exposed Advanced Placement reading material | Reading Teachers , Principal and AP | Regular Departmental meetings to review/analyze improvement in fluency. Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Administrative walk throughs | Fair Testing Data Wall monitoring Thinklink FCAT |
| 3 | Limited class time (only one 50 minute block of instruction) | Differentiated instruction to individual student benchmark weakness FCAT chats AR program After school tutoring Students exposed to Advanced Placement reading material | Reading Teachers, Principal and Assistant Principal | Teacher Assessments and use of Rubrics for projects Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Administrative walk throughs | 1. Fair Testing 2. Data Wall 3. Thinklink 4. FCAT |
| 4 | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate 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 Proces | ss to Increase St | udent Achievement | |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data Submitted | | |

T

T

| | 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: |
| I | |

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | 27% (54/200) will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) on FCAT 2013 |
|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 23% (45/227) | 27% (54/200) |

| | 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 | Limited class time for student and limited planning time for teacher | Differentiated instruction by teacher intervention Gifted Venture program available Accelerated Reading Students exposed to AP reading material | Reading Teachers , Principal and Assistant Principal | to review/analyze improvement in deficient skills. 2. Disseminate and | Fair Testing Data Wall Thinklink Accelerated Reading Data FCAT | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer of improvement for the following group: | rence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need |
|---|---|
| 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 | Position | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

| | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guidinq | g Questions", identify and | define areas in need | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| gains | CAT 2.0: Percentage of s in reading. ing Goal #3a: | tudents making learning | | 64% (128/200) will make Learning Gains in reading on FCAT 2013 | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 59% | (118/200) | | 64% (128/200) | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Fluency: Students struggle through reading passages losing comprehension along the way. | Fluency testing Differentiated instruction FCAT chats 12 Powerful Words AR program After school tutoring Students exposed to Advanced Placement reading material Bellwork: Cold Reads | Reading Teachers, Principal and Assistant Principal | Departmental meetings, pre-planning inservice and individual subject area teachers disaggregating data to analyze improvement in fluency. Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Analyze Classworks and Thinklink data, Data Wall and FCAT | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall FCAT Thinklink Florida Reads AMSCO | |
| 2 | Students are demonstrating low performance across all grade levels in Reading Application | Fluency testing Differentiated instruction FCAT chats 12 Powerful Words AR program After school tutoring Students exposed to Advanced Placement reading material Bellwork: Cold Reads | Reading Teachers, Principal and Assistant Principal | Teacher Assessments and use of Rubrics for projects Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Analyze Classworks and Thinklink data, Data Wall and FCAT supplemental materials. | Projects related to novels FCAT Data Wall Thinklink Florida Reads 6 Way Paragraph REA and AMSCO | |

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 | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

| | l on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and a | define areas in need | |
|-------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| makir | AT 2.0: Percentage of stong learning gains in read | | | 50% (19/39) of Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading FCAT 2013 | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 18% (| (7/39) | | 50% (19/39) | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Fluency: Students struggle through reading passages losing comprehension along the way. | Fluency testing across the curriculum throughout the year Differentiated instruction and teacher intervention Word Walls 2 Blocks of Reading AIP's and student portfolios Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. After school tutoring Bellwork: Cold Reads Lexia | Reading Teachers, Principal, and AP | Regular Departmental meetings to discuss/analyze improvement in fluency. Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall FCAT Thinklink Florida Reads | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Students are demonstrating low performance across all grade levels in Reading Application | Fluency testing across the curriculum throughout the year. Differentiated instruction FCAT chats 12 Powerful Words AR program After school tutoring Students exposed Advanced Placement reading material | Reading Teachers, Principal and AP | Teacher Assessments and use of Rubrics for projects Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Analyze Classworks and Thinklink data, Data Wall and FCAT | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall FCAT Thinklink Florida Reads | |

| Measur | able Ob will red | but Achievable A jectives (AMOs) uce their achieve | In six year | Reading Goal # Target p 5A : | | .ll be de | etermined by FLDOF | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | ne data -2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-201 | 4 2014 | -2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | 60 6 | 3 | 67 | 71 | | 74 | |
| | | analysis of stude It for the followir | | ent data, and re | eference to "Gu | iiding Que | stions", identify and | define areas in nee |
| Hispar satisfa Readir | nic, Asia actory p ng Goal | | idian) not m ding. | | | | will make satisfactory) will make satisfacto | |
| Black: | 55% (4 | Level of Perfor 7/86) did not ma 3/111) did not r F | ike satisfacto nake satisfac | tory progress | Black: 60% | 5 (52/86) 6 (72/111 | el of Performance: will make satisfactory)will make satisfactor hievement | |
| | Antic | ipated Barrier | Sti | rategy | Person or Position Responsible Monitoring | for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Toc |
| p S | Fluency: Students struggle through reading passages losing comprehension along the way. | | | ipal revie ipal revie impr 2. D discu indiv pers cont | egular Departmental tings to ew/analyze ovement in fluency. isseminate and uss with students vidually about their onal FCAT data and ent area strengths weaknesses | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall monitoring FCAT Thinklink Florida Reads | | |
| 2 Students are demonstrating low performance across all grade levels in Reading Application 2 2 3 4 1. Fluency te reading class 2. Differentia instruction 3. FCAT cha 4. 12 Powerf 5. AR progra 6. After scho 7. Students Advanced Pl reading mate | | sses tiated erful Words ram hool tutoring s exposed Placement | Reading Teach Principal and Assistant Princ | ipal mee revie impr 2. D discu indiv pers cont | egular Departmental tings to ew/analyze ovement in fluency. isseminate and uss with students vidually about their onal FCAT data and ent area strengths weaknesses | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall monitoring FCAT Thinklink Florida Reads | | |
| t a | petween | differences home/family an ic setting at | Practice ar d proper grar | | All teachers, Principal and Assistant Princ | ipal revie impr pape | egular Departmental tings to ew/analyze rovement in written ers and student versations | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Data Wall Monitoring FCAT Thinklink |

| | l on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | referer | nce to "Guiding | Questions", identify and | define areas in need |
|--|--|-----------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | | | | Our ELL subgroup is not large enough to generate a subgroup. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| n/a | | | n | n/a | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to I no | crease Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Res | Person or Position sponsible for Vonitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | | n/a | n/a |

| | d on the analysis of studer provement for the following | | refere | ence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and | define areas in need |
|---|--|------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | | | Our SWD subgroup is not large enough to generate a subgroup. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | |
| n/a | | | | n/a | | |
| | Pi | roblem-Solving Process | s to I r | ncrease Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Re | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | | n/a | n/a |

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | 65% (95) of our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will make AYP in reading FCAT 2013 | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 59%(86) | 65%(95) | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | ncrease Student Achievement | | |
| | Person or Process Used to | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Fluency: Students struggle through reading passages losing comprehension along the way. | Fluency testing in reading classes Differentiated instruction and teacher intervention Word walls 2 Blocks of Reading AIP's and student portfolios Supplemental Instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors Bellwork: Cold Reads Lexia | Reading Teachers, Principal and AP | Regular Departmental meetings to discuss/analyze improvement in fluency. Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses. Administrative walk throughs | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall FCAT Florida Reads Thinklink |
| 2 | Students are demonstrating low performance across all grade levels in Reading Application | Fluency testing in reading classes Differentiated instruction FCAT chats 12 Powerful Words AR program After school tutoring Students exposed Advanced Placement reading material Bellwork: Cold Reads Lexia | Reading Teachers, Principal and AP | Regular Departmental meetings to review/analyze improvement in fluency. Disseminate and discuss with students individually about their personal FCAT data and content area strengths and weaknesses | Fair Testing 12 Powerful Words Strategy Data Wall monitoring FCAT Florida Reads Thinklink |

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 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Jackson County District Wide Inservice August 10, 2012 (Common Core and Quality Lesson Plans) | 6-12 Reading/Language Arts | District Facilitators | grades 6-12 Reading Teachers | on going | Departmental Meetings to continue dialogue | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading and Language Arts Teachers |
| Esol training | Reading/Language Arts 6-12 | District Level | Language Arts teacher, Jeff Edge and reading teacher, Nancianne Watson | Summer 2012 - summer 2013 | will continue track to be ESOL endorsed by summer 2013 | Language Arts teacher, Jeff Edge and reading teacher, Nancianne Watson |
| Common Core Standards and Reading/Language Arts plan (GHS-in house) | Reading/Language Arts teachers grades 6-12 | Principal, Asst Principal, Reading/Language Arts teachers | All Language Arts and Reading teachers, Principal, Asst Principal | Summer 2012 and ongoing | Departmental meetings and collegial dialogue | Principal, Asst Principal, Reading Teachers and Language Arts Teachers |
| Just Read, Florida Next | | | | | | |

| Generation Content Area Reading- Jackson District | 6-12 Reading | District Level Consultant: Kathy Oropallo | 3 Social Studies teachers | August 16, 2012 and ongoing | Departmental meetings | Principal and Asst Principal |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| GHS Data Team: 2012 Data Disaggregation and Strategies | 6-12 Reading/Language Arts | Principal, Asst Principal, SIP chair | Reading/Language Arts grades 6-12 | June 2012 and ongoing | Faculty meetings to continue dialogue | Principal, Asst Principal, Reading and Language Arts teachers |
| RtI Workshop | 6-12 all subjects and content area | Asst Principal and RtI Content Specialist | Reading/Language Arts 6-12 | July 2012 and ongoing | RtI meetings | Principal, Asst Principal, RtI Content Specialist |
| Common Core Institute- Panama City, FL | 6-12, all subjects | FL DOE | Principal, ESE teacher, Social Studies teacher | July 9-12th, 2012 and ongoing meetings to share/correlate standards to instuction | Faculty meetings and departmental meetings throughout year | Principal, Asst Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Expose English College Readiness Classes and Advanced Placement Classes to more college type literature | 50 Essays: a portable anthology | Parent Teacher Organization | \$584.76 |
| Students read classic literature as a class | (50) Where the Red Fern Grows | 9508 | \$249.70 |
| Expand student reading material | Books for Library | 1339 | \$1,594.50 |
| Expand reading material with relevance to student interest | Scholastic Magazine | 5555 | \$218.90 |
| Class sets of books | Bluford series | 1336 | \$80.80 |
| | | Subto | otal: \$2,728.60 |
| 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 To | otal: \$2,728.6 |

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 pr | oficient in listening/speak | king. | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Proficient in li | istening/speaki | ing: | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to Increase S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Strategy Strategy | | | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| 2. Students scoring pr | 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Proficient in re | eading: | | |
| | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Increase S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Notes and Strategy Monitoring | | | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |

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

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr | 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 CELLA Goals

| Based of imp | l on the analysis of studen provement for the following | t achievement data, and re g group: | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and a | define areas in need | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| math | 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: | | | 42% (52/124) will achieve proficiency FCAT Level 3 in math FCAT 2013 | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | | |
| 36% (| (45/124) | | 42% (52/124) | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process 1 | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Students demonstrated deficient skills in Geometry/Measurement | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 for students in danger of falling back a level or working towards increasing a level. Align and instruct remedial geometry/measurement skills in regular math classes Spiraling geometry/measurement content area in Bellwork Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors | | Monthly math departmental meetings to review student assessments Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area Walk throughs by administration | Math FCAT 2013 Teacher assessments Test Specs Mini assessments Thinklink Buckledown Data Wall | | |
| 3 | Low student interest and motivatiotn towards deficient math content area. | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 for students between levels that may fall back a level or could go up a level Spiraling deficient content area in Bellwork | Principal, AP, and math teachers | Monthly math departmental meetings to review student assessments Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area Administrative walk throughs | Math FCAT 2013 Teacher assessments Test Specs Mini assessments Data Wall Thinklink | | |

| | | 5. Supplemental instruction with peer counselors | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| 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 Exp | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to | Increase S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy For for | | son or ition ponsible nitoring | 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 mathematics. | 20% (25/124) will achieve above proficiency Levels 4 and 5 | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2a: | on FCAT 2013 | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 13% (16/124) | 20% (25/124) | | |

| | 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 | Limited instruction time (one period per day as opposed to 2 periods per day for Levels 1 and 2) | FCAT data chats to help student recognize and concentrate on deficient area either in regular class or enrichment activities Differentiate whole class instruction as time and staff permits Gifted program Venture available Track select students to progress ahead of normal paced class and move at quicker individual pace with emphasis on | Principal, AP and math teachers | Monthly math departmental meetings to review student assessments Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area Administrative walk throughs | Math FCAT 2013 Standardized assessements in class Thinklink Data Wall monitoring | | | | |

| problem solving. | |
|------------------|--|
| | |

| | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perfor | mance: | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to I | ncrease S [.] | tudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and referred of improvement for the following group: | erence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | lefine areas in need | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | 65% (81/124) will make Learning Gains in math FCAT 2013 | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | |
| 60% (75/124) | 65% (81/124) | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| | Person or | Process Used to | | | | |

| motivation towards deficient math content area.awareness of low content area with FCAT data chatsteachers, and intervention teachersdepartmental meetings to review student assessments2. Teacher Assessments an | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area3. Data Wall13. Align and instruct remedial skills in accordance to regular3. Administratiave walk throughs4. Thinklink | | motivation towards deficient math content | awareness of low content area with FCAT | teachers, and intervention | departmental meetings to review student assessments | 2. Teacher Assessments and standarized mini |
| remedial skills in accordance to regular | 1 | | remediation classes outside basic math class | | data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area | 3. Data Wall |
| 5. Spiraling deficient content area in Bellwork | | | remedial skills in accordance to regular math classes 5. Spiraling deficient | | throughs | |

| | | 6. AIP's and portfolios on students Level 1 and 2 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | Geometry/Measurement content area was deficient | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 | Principal, AP, math teachers, and intervention teachers | departmental meetings to review student assessments 2. Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area | 2. Teacher assessments 3. Test Specs Mini assessments 4. Classworks |
| 2 | | Align and instruct remedial geometry/measurement skills in regular math classes Spiraling geometry/measurement content area in Bellwork | | 3. Administrative walk throughs | 5. Data Wall 6. Thinklink |
| | | 5. AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and 2 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: | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: | | | | | |
| | orformanco | | 2012 Evr | pected Level of Perform | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 LA | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvin | g Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | 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 nee of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | 50% (13/25)of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in Math 2013 | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 36% (9/25) | 50% (13/25) | | | | |

| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool |
| | | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | |
| | Geometry/measurement content area was deficient | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats | Principal, AP, math teachers and interventions teachers | departmental meetings to review student assessments | Math FCAT 201 Teacher assessments |
| | | 2. Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 | | 2. Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area | Test Specs Mir assessments Data Wall |
| | | 3. Align and instruct remedial skills in regular math classes | | 3. Administrative walk throughs | 5. Thinklink |
| 1 | | 4. Spiraling geometry/measurement content area in Bellwork | | | |
| | | 6. Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. | | | |
| | | 7. AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and 2 students | | | |
| | | 8. Before and after school tutoring | | | |
| | Low student interest and motivation towards deficient math content area. | 1. Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats | Principal, AP, math teachers and interventions teachers | Principal, AP, math teachers and interventions teachers | Math FCAT 201 Teacher assessments |
| | | 2. Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class | | | 3. Test Specs Mir assessments |
| | | grades 6-8 and high school retakes | | | 4. Data Wall 6. Thinklink |
| | | 3. Align and instruct remedial skills in regular math classes grades 9- 10, and 11-12 retakes | | | 0. 1111111111 |
| 2 | | 4. Spiraling geometry/measurement content area in Bellwork | | | |
| | | 6. Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. | | | |
| | | 7. AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and 2 students | | | |
| | | 8. Before and after school tutoring | | | |

| | | | Middle School | Mathe | matics Goal # | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|---|--|---|---|
| Measurable (| s but Achievable Objectives (AMOs) educe their achiev |). In six year | 5A : | | | | |] |
| Baseline dat 2010-2011 | a 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 4 | 2014-201 | 5 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 46 | 51 | 56 | | 61 | | 66 | |
| | e analysis of stude ent for the followi | | | eferen | ce to "Guiding | Quest | ions", identify and c | define areas in ne |
| Hispanic, As satisfactory | subgroups by e sian, American I y progress in ma s Goal #5B: | ndian) not n | | BI | lack: 50% (31) /hite: 61% (37 | /62) w //61) n | ade satisfactory pro ill make satisfactory nade satisfactory pro Il make satisfactory | progress |
| 2012 Currei | nt Level of Perfo | rmance: | | 20 | 013 Expected | l Leve | l of Performance: | |
| Black: 32% (White: 39% | (42/62)did not ma (20/62) did make (24/61) did not n (37/61) made sat | satisfactory p nake satisfact isfactory prog | orogress ory progress gress | W | /hite: 65% (42 | 2/61) v | make progress /ill make satisfactory | / progress |
| | | Problem-Sol | ving Process t | to inc | rease Studer | it Achi | levement | |
| Ant | icipated Barrier | St | rategy | Res | Person or Position ponsible for lonitoring | | rocess Used to Determine ffectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Too |
| motiva part to | udent interest ar ation on student owards deficeint content areas. | awareness | of low rea with FCAT | teach | pal, AP, math lers, and vention lers | depar reviev | nthly math tmental meetings to v student sments | Math FCAT 20 Teacher assessments |
| 1 | | remediatio outside ba grades 6-8 3. Spiraling geometry/ | sic math class } | | | data v data r highlig deficie | gular monitoring vall and teacher notebooks ghting students ent in content area ministrative walk ghs | Standardized Mini assessments Data Wall Buckledown Thinklink |
| | | counselors tutors. 7. AIP's ar | with peer and volunteer and student for Level 1 and | | | | | |
| | | 8. Before a school tuto | oring | D • • | | | | 4 44 11 5615 |
| | etry /measuremen nt area was .nt | awareness | of low rea with FCAT | teach | pal, AP, math lers, and vention lers | depar reviev assess | tmental meetings to v student sments | Math FCAT 20 Teacher assessments |
| | | remediatio | ly scheduled n classes sic math class | | | data v data r | gular monitoring vall and teacher notebooks ghting students | 3. Standardized Mini assessment |

| | grades 6-8 | deficient in content are | a 4. Data Wall |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2 | Spiraling geometry/measurement content area in Bellwork Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. | 3. Administrative walk throughs | 5. Thinklink 6. Buckledown |
| | AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and 2 students Before and after | | |
| | school tutoring | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | | | n/a | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| n/a | | | n/a | n/a | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | |

| | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | | |
| n/a | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy R | | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 n/a n/a n/a | | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | |

| | onomically Disadvantage factory progress in math | - | 58% (50/86) of satisfactory pro | Economically Disadvantag | ed did not make |
|------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Math | nematics Goal E: | | | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| | (50/86)did not make satisfa (36/86)did make satisfactor | | 50% (43/86)wil | I make satisfactory progres | SS |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Low student interest and motivation towards deficient math content area | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 Spiraling geometry content area in Bellwork Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and 2 students Before and after school tutoring | Principal, AP, math teachers, and intervention teachers | Monthly math departmental meetings to review student assessments Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area Administrative walk throughs | Math FCAT 201 Teacher Assessments and Mini Standardized Assessemtns Data Wall Thinklink Buckledown |
| 2 | Geometry/measurement content area was deficient | Increase student awareness of low content area with FCAT data chats Regularly scheduled remediation classes outside basic math class grades 6-8 Spiraling geometry content area in Bellwork Supplemental instruction with peer counselors and volunteer tutors. AIP's and student portfolios for Level 1 and | Principal, AP, math teachers and intervention teachers | Monthly math departmental meetings to review student assessments Regular monitoring data wall and teacher data notebooks highlighting students deficient in content area Administrative walk throughs | Math FCAT 201 Teacher Assessments and Mini Standardized Assessemtns Data Wall Thinklink Buckledown |



6. Before and after school tutoring

End of Middle School Mathematics 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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible 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 n 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 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I | ncrease S | itudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Γ | 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:

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-Solvin | g Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievemen | t |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Resp for Mon | | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data | | | Submitted | | |

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

| Based on Amb | Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Mathematics Go | al # | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | | 2014-201 | 5 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the a of improvemer 5B. Student s Hispanic, Asia satisfactory p | nt for the follow subgroups by an, American | ving subgroup: ethnicity (Wh Indian) not n | nite, Black, | ference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need Black: 70% will make satisfactory progress | | | | |
| Mathematics | Goal #5B: | | | V | /hite: 70% will | make | e satisfactory progres | SS |
| 2012 Current | Level of Perf | ormance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| Black: 16/22 (73%) did not make satisfactory progress 6/22 (27%) did make satisfactory progress White: 7/21 (33%) did not make satisfactory progress 14/21(67%) did make satisfactory progress | | | Black: 70% will make satisfactory progress White: 70% will make satisfactory progress | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | | | | Inc | crease Studen | t Ach | nievement | |
| | | | l | Person or Position | F | Process Used to | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | realizing implications of failing EOC | Encourage mastery of skills throughout year. Before and after school tutoring. | dept, tutors | Data Wall and year long class assessments, standardized test practices | Algebra EOC | |

| | | Remedial classes during regular schedule. | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|---|-------------|
| 2 | 1. Algebra EOC test specs and testing format not clear or readily | Teachers will continue to access FLDOE for test specs and testing format Attend Algebra EOc inservices | dept, | Data Wall and year long class assessments, standardized test practices | Algebra EOC |

| | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need f improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | |
|--|--|--------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | | | not enough numbers to comprise a subgroup | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expe | ected Level of Performa | nce: | |
| n/a not enough numbers to comprise a subgroup | | | n/a | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to L | ncrease St | udent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| No Data Sub | | | | • | | |

| | ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need Fimprovement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------------------------|------|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in Mathematics Goal #5D: | ilities (SWD) not making mathematics. | n/a not enough numbers to comprise a subgroup | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of P | erformance: | | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Performa | nce: | | |
| n/a not enough numbers t | o comprise a subgroup | | n/a | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proc | ess to I | ncrease St | tudent Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | on or ion onsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| | I | Submitted | | | | | |

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

| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making | |
|---|---|
| satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 77% (23/30) did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra |
| Mathematics Goal E: | |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------|---------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 77% (23/30) did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra 23% (7/30) did make satisfactory progress in Algebra | | | 3 | 35% (11/30) will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 2013 | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process to L | | | ncrease Studen | it Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier Strategy R | | | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | Alge | ebra teachers | Standardized tests and teacher constructed tests | Algebra EOC | |

End of High School Mathematics Goals

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:

| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1: | | | (70%)will pass | (70%)will pass the Algebra EOC | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance | e: | | |
| 20/54 (37%) passed the Algebra EOC | | | (70%) will pass | (70%) will pass the Algebra EOC | | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool | | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation room |
|--|---|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| | realizing implications of failing Algebra EOC | | Classroom teachers | Skills tests teacher observation | Algebra EOC |

| 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 |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Algebra.Algebra Goal #2: | 10% (6/58) scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 2% (1/58) | 10% (6/58) |

| L | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | 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 lack motivation to press towards rigor of reaching Level 4 and 5 | Encourage mastery and fluency across skills | Principal, AP, math dept | Review standardized tests in class and Thinklink data | Algebra EOC | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1: | | | | 70% will pass the Geometry EOC | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 20 |)13 Expecte | d Level of Performance | 9: | |
| 14% (5/37) scored at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry | | | | 70% will pass the Geometry EOC | | | |
| | Pro | olem-Solving Process t | to I nci | rease Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | F Resp | erson or Position ponsible for pnitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | 1. Retention of skills seems to be low | Before and after school tutoring Remedial classes in main schedule | Princ, | pal, Asst Math ers, tutors | Class assessments and standardized practice tests | Geometry EOC | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define a in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 4 and | udents scoring at or ab d 5 in Geometry. netry Goal #2: | oove Achievement Leve | | at or above Level 4 in G | eometry EOc | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | D/37) students scored at s 4 and 5 in Geometry EC | | 15% will score | 15% will score at or above Level 4 in Geometry EOC | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | Students often want to learn just enough to pass test and no more | remedial skills in regular | Principal, Asst. Principal, Math teachers | Data Wall monitoring Departmental meetings discussions' | Geometry EOC 2013 | |



10 and grades 11-12 retakes 2. Remedial classes for students not passing Geometry EOC or for failing Geometry course over progress and interventions. 3. Thinklink baseline and midyear data.

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 |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Common Core and Math 6-12 Plan 2012- 2013 (GHS in house) | 6-12 Math | Principal, Asst Principal, Math teachers | 6-12 Math teachers | Summer 2012 and ongoing | Departmental meetings and ongoing dialogue | Principal, Asst Principal, Math teachers |
| GHS Data Team: 2012 FCAT/Performand Matters Data Disaggregation and Strategies | 6-12 Math, Reading, Writing and Science | Principal, Asst Principal, SIP chair | 6-12 all content | June 2012 and ongoing | Faculty meetings to continue dialogue | Principal, Asst Principal, Math teachers |
| Common Core Institute- Pananma City, FL | 6-12 all content | FL DOE | Principal, ESE teacher, Social Studies teacher-shared information with faculty in pre- planning days August 2012 | July 9-12th, 2012 and ongoing | Faculty meetings and departmental meetings throughout year | Principal, Asst Principal |
| Jackson County District Wide Inservice August 10, 2012 (Common Core and Quality Lesson Plans) | 6-12 Math | District Facilitators | 6-12 Math teachers | August 2012 and ongoing | Departmental Meetings in GHS to continue dialogue and across county schools dialogue between grade level teachers | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math teachers |
| AP Calculus summer institute in Fort Lauderdale, FL with college board | 12th grade- Calculus | State Level | Calculus teacher, Bryant Hardy | Summer 2012 and Oct 2012 | Departmental meetings | Principal, Asst Principal, Calculus teacher |
| District sponsored Algebra EOC workshop | Algebra teachers | Linda Walker, math consultant | Algebra teachers | August 13, 2012 and ongoing | Departmental meetings | Principal, Asst Principal,Algebra teachers |
| RtI Workshop | 6-12 all | | | | | |

| subjects and content area | | RtI team members | July 2012 and ongoing | RtI meetings | Principal, Assst Principal, RtI Content Specialist |
|------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|
|------------------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|

Mathematics Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|---|----------------|------------------------|
| Remediate Levels 1 and 2 in separate class from regular math | Buckledown math, Algebra I and Geometry | 9508 | \$1,674.87 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,674.8 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,674.8 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Leve | CAT2.0: Students sco I 3 in science. nce Goal #1a: | ring at Achievement | | 8th grade: Increase the number of students who are at or above level 3 on 8th grade FCAT Science. | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perf | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performand | ce: | |
| 8th g | rade: 40% (16/40) | | 8th grade: 50' | 8th grade: 50% (23/46) | | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | Prior science knowledge/vocabulary is low. | Utilize 5E's lesson plan to enhance student learningas outlined in new textbooks. Daily FCAT 2.0 | Science teachers, Principal and Assistant Principal | Analyze data from baseline, mid-year and end of year county assessments Monthly science departmental meetings | year assessment for 7th and 8th grade science | |

| 1 | bellwork activities. 3. Ag Biotech class wwill implement NGSSS in instruction. | progress and analyze | Szpryka 2. FCAT Science 2.0 |
|---|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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: | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | | | |
| Science Goal #1b: | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level o | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | rmance: | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Pro | ocess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievemen | t | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | son or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

| | 3 | dent achievement data, t for the following group | | Guiding Questions", ider | ntify and define | |
|------|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Achi | CAT 2.0: Students sco evement Level 4 in sci nce Goal #2a: | 0 | . , | 3% (1/34) student achieved above proficiency at Levels 4 and 5. | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perf | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performan | ce: | |
| 3% (| 1/34) | | ???? | ???? | | |
| | Prob | elem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stud | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Prior science knowledge/vocabulary is low. New FCAT 2.0 test item specs are implemented this year, and are not as familiar to teachers. | 5 | | Analyze data from baseline, mid-year and end of year county science assessments. Administrative walk- throughs. Dialogue and collaboration with county science consultant D. Szpryka. | year assessment for 7th and 8th | |

| utilize | NGSSS | in | | | | |
|--------------|-------|----|--|--|--|--|
| instruction. | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|----------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. | | | | | |
| Science Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | |

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 | | | | | |

| 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 Exp | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| | | lent achievement data, a t for the following group | | Guiding Questions", ider | ntify and define | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Biolo | udents scoring at Achi ogy. ogy Goal #1: | evement Level 3 in | Biology I: 60% exam | Biology I: 60% of biology students will pass the EOC exam | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 15% of biology students (7/48) | | | 60% (31/52)w | 60% (31/52)will pass Biology EOC | | | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Prior science vocabulary/knowledge is low | Daily FCAT bellwork activities. Reducing required vocabulary to terms on course description. | Science teachers, principal and assistant principal | Monthly science department meetings to monitor student progress and analyze effectiveness of strategies used. Administrative walk- throughs. Dialogue and collaboration with Dr. Melanie Mitchell, science coach for Jackson Co. | Teacher created classroom assessments | | |

| | Student will often not | 1. Follow curriculum | Principal, AP, | 1. Weekly meetings | Biology EOC |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | keep pace with rigor of | pacing guide provided | biology teachers | with biology teachers | exam |
| | upper science | by Dr. Melanie Mitchell. | | to evaluate student | |
| 1 | curriculum | | | performance on | |
| 4 | | 2. Common planning of | | classroom | |
| | | assignments/ lessons | | assessments. | |
| | | by biology teachers. | | 2. Administrative walk- | |
| | | | | throughs. | |

| 5 | of student achievement data rement for the following grou | | l reference | e to "Guiding Questions" | , identify and define |
|---|--|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2: | | | 5% (2/39) scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology EOC | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| 0% (0/39) scored at or and 5 in Biology EOC | above Achievement Levels | 5% (2/39) will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on Biology EOC | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | 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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Biology Partnership | Grades 6-12 Science | PAEC | Amanda Bloomer | 8 monthly meetings September 2012-May 2013, summer sessions-June 2013 | Principal, Asst Principal, Paula Wright, Amanda Bloomer | Principal, Asst Principal, Paula Wright, Amanda Bloomer |
| 12 semester hours in biology content to complete Master's Degree and enhance content knowledge | 6-12 Science | Troy University | Amanda Bloomer | Summer 2012 | Addition of dual enrollment course offering for BSC 2010/BSC2010L and BSC2011/BSC2011L | Principal, Asst Principal, Paula Wright, Amanda Bloomer |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Dual Enrolled students/Advanced Placement | Campbell biology textbooks (14) | 1336 | \$2,069.48 |
| Advanced placement/Dual Enrollment | (11) textbooks Mastering Biology | 1336 | \$715.00 |
| Increase science lab experience | Science enzymes kit | 1337 | \$124.30 |
| Increase science lab experience | Science kit | 1337 | \$429.95 |
| Increase science lab experience | Science kit | 1336 | \$51.68 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,390.4 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

| | d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the | | nd reference to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | y and define areas | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | | | | 77% (53/69) scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performance | 2: | |
| 77% in wri | | rement Level 3.0 and hig | . , | 90% (62/69) will score at Achievement Level 3.0 in writing FCAT 2013 | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Too | |
| | low because FCAT writing does not count | responses) 2. Continue AR program in order to increase exposure to complex | Principal, AP, Writing Teachers | Reading Departmental meetings monthly or sooner as needs arise Administrative walk throughs | Writing FCAT 2013 Jackson Write Extended response questions on | |
| 1 | as a graduation requirement. | exposure to complex vocabulary | | | response questions o teacher | |

| 3. Low vocabulary and | Expand reading context towards more | | assessments |
|-----------------------|---|--|------------------|
| | informational text | | 4. FCAT Explorer |
| low level readers | | | 4. FCAT EXPIDIEI |
| | 4 Implement "4E days | | |
| 5 5 | 4. Implement "45 days | | |
| 33 | to FCAT" plan | | |
| detriment to formal | | | |
| writing. | | | |

| Based on the analysis o in need of improvement | | | eference to | o "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 | J Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | t |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion bonsible itoring | 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) | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Writing Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Speech class builds writing skills | textbooks | 1336 | \$21.12 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$21.12 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| | | | Grand Total: \$21.12 |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Other | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Developme | ent | | |

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 1. Students scoring at | Achievement Level 3 in C | Civics. | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss 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: | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. | | | | | | |
| Civics Goal #2: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | ss to l | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | 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 |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Ν | lo Data Submittee | d | | |

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 | 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 Civics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group: | eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas |
|---|--|
| 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 Proces | s to Increase S | itudent 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 in need of improvement | f student achievement data, for the following group: | and r | eference to | o "Guiding Questions", i | dentify and define areas |
|---|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in U.S. History | : or above Achievement Le v. | evels | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | 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 |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Ν | lo Data Submitteo | b | | |

U.S. History Budget:

| 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 Developmen | 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 U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Г

| | d on the analysis of atter provement: | ndance data, and referer | nce to "Guiding Que | estions", identify and defi | ine areas in need |
|-------|---|--------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 1. At | tendance | | | | |
| Atter | ndance Goal #1: | | | 011-2012 was 320 95.41 011-2012 was 335. | % |
| 2012 | Current Attendance Ra | ate: | 2013 Expecte | ed Attendance Rate: | |
| 95.41 | % 320/335 | | 97% (325/335) |) | |
| - | Current Number of Stunces (10 or more) | udents with Excessive | 2013 Expecte Absences (10 | ed Number of Students or more) | with Excessive |
| | (146)2011 (117)2012 | | 35% (122)met Expected numl 30% (100/335) | ber with excessive absen | ces for 2013 |
| | Current Number of Stu ies (10 or more) | udents with Excessive | 2013 Expecte Tardies (10 o | ed Number of Students r more) | with Excessive |
| | 125)2011 not reported yet | | 45%(95)goal fo | or 2012 | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Students return to school after an absence without a written excuse from parent or doctor | 0 0 1 | Principal, AP, parents, and teachers | Monitor attendance and tardy data in Pinncacle Program | |

| 1 | | of year and used all year long by student as reference/hall pass/homework 3. Attendance/tardy monitoring available to parent through Pinnacle Program 4. Parent contacts by administrators and teachers by phone, letter, agenda book, and e-mail 5. Administrative meetings with students to warn/encourage punctuality and atttendance. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---------|
| 2 | Students do not manage time well between classes | 1. Parents access Pinnacle website for awareness of daily tardies for their child 2. Teachers monitoring halls between classes and routing students quickly to their classes 3. Teachers and administrators contact parents about tardies 4. GHS has added an extra minute between classes (now 5 minutes between classes) | Principal, AP, teachers, and parents | Monitor Pinnacle tardies and Administrators/teachers contact parents about infractions | program |

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

| Subtotal: \$0.00 Available |
|-------------------------------|
| Available |
| Available |
| Amount |
| \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Grand Total: \$0.00 |
| C |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

| | d on the analysis of susp provement: | ension data, and referen | nce t | o "Guiding Que | stions", identify and define | ne areas in need | |
|---|--|---|--------|--|--|------------------|--|
| | Ispension | | | | | | |
| Suspension Goal #1: | | | | GHS will work toward decreasing ISS and OSS by 25% | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | | | | 2013 Expecte | d Number of In-School | Suspensions | |
| 5% (19)2011 4% (14)2012 | | | | 4% (15)goal met for 2012 2013 expected number of In-School Suspensions 3% (10/335) | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | 2013 Expecte School | d Number of Students | Suspended In- | |
| 4% (14/335) | | | | 4% (14/335) | | | |
| 2012 | 2 Number of Out-of-Sch | ool Suspensions | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | |
| 18% (64)2011 19% (64) 2012 | | | | 16% (55) 2012 16% (54) 2013 | | | |
| 2012 Scho | 2 Total Number of Stude | ents Suspended Out-of | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | |
| 18% | (64) | | | 16% (55) | | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to I r | ncrease Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | | Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Students do not possess intrinsic value of staying out of trouble | Conferences with student, parent, teacher, adminstration to identify negative behavior Identify and intervene school level situations that may escalate into a suspension Character First instruction | | | Behavior contracts Positive comments/praise when student models improved behavior Behavior Tracking Charts for Middle School | DEO reports | |

| 5. Student has Agenda book with details of every school rule 6. Student and parent sign Handbook/Code of Conduct Contract at beginning of year. 7. Student Support |
|---|
|---|

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

| | Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Dr | opout Prevention | | | N/A to Graceville High School | | | | |
| Drop | out Prevention Goal #1 | : | N/A to Gracevil | | | | | |
| | se refer to the percentaged out during the 2011-2 | | | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Dropout Rate: | | 2013 Expecte | d Dropout Rate: | | | | |
| n/s | | | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Graduation Ra | te: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: | | | | |
| n/a | n/a | | | n/a | | | | |
| | Prok | blem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | |

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.0 |
| | | * | Subtotal: \$0.0 |

| 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)

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and r in need of improvement: | eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas |
|--|---|
| Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or | 50% of parents will be involved in their child's activities at school |
| unduplicated. | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 40% ((140)2011 40% (134/335) | 50% (175)2012 50% (168/335) |
| Droblem Colving Dropped to | Lacrosso Student Ashievement |

| Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | nt Achievement | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| to participate in school activities. | GHS will increase parent awareness and interest towards participation by: 1. Signed progress report and report cards for student credit or reward 2. Coordinate multiple activities on same night to allow parents to attend and save time 3. Phone calls and letters from teachers and administration 4. Agenda books used as means of communication 5. Marquis on campus highlights daily/weekly activities 6. Schedule AIP meetings on same day as Open House in August 7. PTO/SAC meetings 8. Parent Volunteer | | Rosters for meetings, conferences, and parent volunteer and support | 1. End of year parent survey 2. Volunteer documentation |

| | Program 9. Parent Booster Clubs (Band, Show Choir, Athletic, Project Graduation) 10. Student Support Team meetings 11. School wide grades 6-12 College and Career night 12. District Parent/Community Advisory Council Meetings | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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 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 | hent | | |
| 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 |

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 a | areas in need of improvement: |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM STEM Goal #1: | Increase student enrollment in: BSC 2011/2011L dual enrollment Biology, Ag Biotech classes, and AP Calculus |

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 | 1. Cost of certification exams place on student for Ag Biotech | exams for students | | teacher observation | Ag Biotech: Industry certification exam |
| 2 | 1. Dual enrollment Biology BSC 2011/2011L: student must qualify academically to enroll | 1. Encourage students to take ACT and SAT to increase science score | Princ, Biology | | Mid-Term and Final Exam |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Biology Partnership | grades 6-12 science | PAEC | Amanda Bloomer | 8 monthly meetings September 2012-May 2013, summer sessions-June 2013 | Monitor student achievement on classroom assessments | Principal, Asst Princ, biology dept |
| 12 semester hours in biology content to complete Master's Degree and enhance content knowledge | grades 6-12 science | Troy University | Amanda Bloomer | summer 2012 | Addition of dual enrollment course offering for BSC 2010/BSC2010L and BSC2011/BSC2011L | Principal, AP, biology dept |
| AP Calculus | 12th grade Calculus | Summer Institute College Board -Fort Lauderdale, FL | Bryant Hardy | summer 2012 and Oct 2012 | Calculus Mid-term and Final Exam | Principal, Asst Principal,Bryant Hardy |

| District sponsored Algebra EOC workshop | Linda Walker, math consultant | Algebra teachers | | Departmental Meetings and Algebra EOC | Principal, AP, Algebra teachers |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|

STEM Budget:

п

| 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 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 | d on the analysis of schoo | ol data, identify and defi | ne areas in need of | improvement: | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. CT CTE (| E Goal #1: | | Increase numb Certification ex | per of students to pass Ir am | ndustry |
| | Prol | blem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Cost of industry certificate exam | Seek ways to cover cost of exam for student | Principal, Asst Principal, Ag Depart, District Level | Year long class assessments and teacher observation | Industry Certification Exam |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Ν | lo Data Submitteo | d | | |

CTE Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Increase student enrollment in CTE classes | Certifications | 5555 | \$1,259.30 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,259.30 |
| 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: \$1,259.3 |

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Progr | ram(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Expose English College Readiness Classes and Advanced Placement Classes to more college type literature | 50 Essays: a portable anthology | Parent Teacher Organization | \$584.76 |
| Reading | Students read classic literature as a class | (50) Where the Red Fern Grows | 9508 | \$249.70 |
| Reading | Expand student reading material | Books for Library | 1339 | \$1,594.50 |
| Reading | Expand reading material with relevance to student interest | Scholastic Magazine | 5555 | \$218.90 |
| Reading | Class sets of books | Bluford series | 1336 | \$80.80 |
| Mathematics | Remediate Levels 1 and 2 in separate class from regular math | Buckledown math, Algebra I and Geometry | 9508 | \$1,674.87 |
| Science | Dual Enrolled students/Advanced Placement | Campbell biology textbooks (14) | 1336 | \$2,069.48 |
| Science | Advanced placement/Dual Enrollment | (11) textbooks Mastering Biology | 1336 | \$715.00 |
| Science | Increase science lab experience | Science enzymes kit | 1337 | \$124.30 |
| Science | Increase science lab experience | Science kit | 1337 | \$429.95 |
| Science | Increase science lab experience | Science kit | 1336 | \$51.68 |
| Writing | Speech class builds writing skills | textbooks | 1336 | \$21.12 |
| CTE | Increase student enrollment in CTE classes | Certifications | 5555 | \$1,259.30 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$9,074.36 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developr 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: \$9,074.36 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority jn Focus jn Prevent jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

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 SAC will meet 4 times during the 2012-2013 school year. The SAC will continue to be a part of and approve updates to the SIP, be available for the upcoming district/school accreditation process and maintain dialogue between parents, community, students and faculty for suggestions to improve student academics and climate of school.

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

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Points | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 60% | 60% | 76% | 45% | 241 | 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 | 62% | 64% | | | 126 | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 55% (YES) | 59% (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 | | | | | 481 | |
| Percent Tested = 98% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | в | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Jackson School Distric GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH 2009-2010 | | Math | Writing | Science | Grade | |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH | HOOL | Math | Writing | Science | Points | |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH | HOOL | Math 71% | Writing 86% | Science 55% | | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH 2009-2010 % Meeting High Standards (FCAT | HOOL Reading 60% | | | | Points Earned | 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 |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH 2009-2010 % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) % of Students Making Learning Gains Adequate Progress of | HOOL Reading 60% | 71% | | | Points Earned 272 | 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. 3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH 2009-2010 % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) % of Students Making Learning Gains Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | HOOL Reading 60% 60% | 71% | | | Points Earned 272 137 | 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. 3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading |
| GRACEVILLE HIGH SCH 2009-2010 % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) % of Students Making Learning Gains Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the | HOOL Reading 60% 60% | 71% | | | Points Earned 272 137 134 | 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. 3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading |