_

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LIFE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION ACADEMY

District Name: Lee

Principal: Linda M. Pottorf

SAC Chair: William Mckinley

Superintendent: Joseph P Burke, Ed.D

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 9/21/2012



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	Linda M. Pottorf	BS Personnel Management Ms Ed Leadership	7	39	This school is not graded. Majority of our students are in grade 12+ We only tested 3 -6 in any measured area. All of the students are Intellectually Disabled. Witin this population there is a wide range of intellectual ability as well as a many physical disabilities. These impact the consistency of performance on the Floida Alternative Assessment. Our students show consistent growth in life skills. communication and work experience.

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)
NA	NA	NA			NA

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	In a small school charter school ,(4 teachers) it is difficult to maintain stability without clearly defined hiring practices . It is important to build a team and take input on their goals and needs when replacing a staff person. In the principal's interview process there must be careful examination of qualifications, references and experiences. Once the candidates are interviewed , those meeting the highest qualifications , interview again with the staff. New hires are provided administrative and staff mentoring to assure success. Staff development is also available .	principal	ongpoing	

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
None	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
4	0.0%(0)	25.0%(1)	50.0%(2)	25.0%(1)	50.0%(2)	100.0%(4)	50.0%(2)	0.0%(0)	50.0%(2)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee	Rationale	Planned Mentoring
	Assigned	for Pairing	Activities
NA	NA	NA	NA

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Violence i revention i rogi anis
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other
ouio
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
Calcast Is and MTCC /DH Tang
CSchool-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Since all of the students at L.I.F.E. Academy have been identified as intellectually disabled and they have IEP's , there is no need for an RtI team.

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?
NA
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?
NA
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.
NA
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
NA
Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)
-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Since all of the students have been identified as intellectually disabled and have IEP's , there is no need for an LLT.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
NA
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
NA
Public School Choice
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment
*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

*Grades 6-12 Only

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.
*High Schools Only
Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?
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?
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 Feedback Report</u>

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

level of all of the

points in plans as

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Na Reading Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: NΑ NA Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Student's individual IEP Reding goals will be focus teachers and IEP IEP meetings and Unique Learning goals will need to be at IEP's Systems team assessment developed to focus them assessments towards meeting their reading goals as applicable 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 will have IEP goals that reflect reading strategies Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. at their level. In 2011-2012 33% (2 of 6 tested) scored in levels 4,5 and 6 in reading . In 2012-2013 40 % will score in Reading Goal #1b: levels 4,5,6 as measured by thr FAA 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In 2012-2013 40% will score in levels 4,5,6 in reading as 33% (2 out of 6 scored in level 4,5, or 6 measure by the FAA Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy 6 students were assesed Student's IEP goals will Teacher and IEP Unique Learning Systems Unique learning in Reading 2 were in level reflect pre reading assessments systems, teacher 4,5, or 6. Students who goals.Student will assessments FAA are intellectually disabled continue using a have a difficult time communication device moving a level in a year Most IEP goals are longer range Performance on the FAA Teachers will use ULS Principal ULS ULS FAA is impacted by the curriculum and include Principal observation cognitive functioning appropriate Access

	students as well as the myriad of other disabilites .	apprpriate				
Based	d on the analysis of studen	t achievement data, and r	referer	nce to "Guidina	Ouestions" identify and	define areas in nee
	provement for the following				, automorio i iudining una	
1	CAT 2.0: Students scorir	ng at or above Achievem	nent			
Level	I 4 in reading.		F	AA results diffe	erent than FCAT	
Read	ing Goal #2a:					
2012	Current Level of Perforr	mance:	2	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance	:
NA			N	IA		
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	toInd	crease Studer	nt Achievement	
				Person or	Process Used to	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Position sponsible for	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
			N	Monitoring	Strategy	
1	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA
	d on the analysis of studen		referer	nce to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in need
	provement for the following					
readi	ents scoring at or above ng. ing Goal #2b:	Achievement Level 7 in	n		students out of 9 (22% FAA In 2012/2013 27% reading .	
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:	2	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance	:
9 stu	dents tested 2 in level 7 (22%)		n 2012/2013 23 by the FAA	7% will score in level 7 o	r above as measured
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	toInd	crease Studer	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
1	It is difficult for students who are ID to progress one level in a year . 6 students were tested . One (16%) scored at level 7	Continue to write individula goals in the IEP that are math related	IEP t	Monitoring eam	Strategy IEP meetings and achievemnt of goals	FAA and IEP
2	This program continues to transpose data from one area of the plan to another and will not allow the first strategy to be corrected					ULS FAA
3	Performance is impacted by the cognitive and physical disbilities of the student population All of the students are intellectually disabled and moving from one level to	Teachers will continue to use the Unique Learning systems curriculum and include the appropriate Axccess points in plans	Teac Princ	hers and ipal	observation ULS assessments	FAA amd ULS assessment

	the next is not easily attained in a year					
	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following		efere	ence to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	define areas in nee
gains	CAT 2.0: Percentage of s s in reading. ling Goal #3a:	tudents making learning			ng gains are all measured tate assessmnet	by achievement of
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
NA				NA		
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	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 Too
1	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA
of impose of imp	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following lorida Alternate Assessnentage of students making. Sing Goal #3b:	g group: nent:		In 2012 2 out oreading . All of are making stroself care and sa	of 9 students (22%) made the students are intellectu ong gains in communicatio offety. Testing small numbe how a clear picture of gro	a level gain in ually disabled and n, self advocacy, ers in reading on th
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
2 out FAA	of 9 students showed a le	arning gain of 1 level on tl		In 2012/2013 2 measured by th		e level in readingas
	Pr	roblem-Solving Process	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 Too
1	Students continue to make gains in their IEP goals which are not necessarily tested on the FAA 33% (2 out of 6) middle school students made a level gain on the FAA	continue to write short and long term IEP goals for communication , prereading and reading	IEP	team	goals achievemnt	IEP meetings FAA ULS
2	Students have multiple barriers to consistant relaiable performance on tests	Teachers will use the ULS curriculum and include access points in plans as appropriate		cher and ncipal	monitoring classrooms through observation	FAA and ULS
of im	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following	g group:	efere	ence to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	define areas in nee
	AT 2.0: Percentage of st ng learning gains in reac			NA		

2012	Current Level of Perfori	mance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance	»:
NA				NA		
	P	roblem-So	Iving Process	to Increase Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	St	rategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too
1	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA
 3ase	d on Ambitious but Achieva	able Annual	Measurable Ob	jectives (AMOs), AM	10-2, Reading and Math	Performance Targe
			D !! O !	"		
5A. A	ambitious but Achievable A	nnual	Reading Goal 7	F		
Meas	urable Objectives (AMOs). of will reduce their achieve	In six year				
	line data 0-2011 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-201	4 2014-201	2015-2016	2016-2017
Baso	d on the analysis of studer	nt achievem	ont data and r	eference to "Guiding	n Ouestions" identify and	d define areas in ne
	provement for the following			ererence to odiding	g Questions , identify and	
5R 9	Student subgroups by eth					
Hispa satis	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read	dian) not r		NA		
Hispa satis Reac	anic, Asian, American In factory progress in read	dian) not r ing.			d Level of Performance	::
Hispasatis Read	anic, Asian, American In factory progress in read ling Goal #5B:	dian) not r ing.			d Level of Performance):
Hispa satis Read 2012	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read ling Goal #5B:	dian) not r ing. mance:	naking	2013 Expected		x:
Hispasatis Read	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read ling Goal #5B:	mance:	naking	2013 Expected		e: Evaluation Too
Hispa Reac	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read ling Goal #5B: 2 Current Level of Perform	mance:	naking	2013 Expected NA to Increase Studen Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	
Hispa satis Reac 2012 NA	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read ling Goal #5B: 2 Current Level of Perform Progress Anticipated Barrier	mance:	naking	2013 Expected NA to Increase Studen Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too
Hispa satis Reac 2012 NA 1	anic, Asian, American Infactory progress in read ling Goal #5B: 2 Current Level of Perform Prince Anticipated Barrier NA	mance: Toblem-So St NA NA	naking Iving Process Trategy ent data, and r	2013 Expected NA to Increase Studen Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring NA NA	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy NA	Evaluation Too NA NA

2012	2 Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
NA			NA	NA					
	P	roblem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
5D. S	nprovement for the following students with Disabilities of actory progress in read sting Goal #5D:	s (SWD) not making	All students are are included in	e intellectually disadbled a other portions	and have IEP's and				
2012	2 Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Expecte	d Level of Performance	:				
na			na						
	P	roblem-Solving Process	to Increase Stude	nt Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	ticipated Barrier Strategy		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
1	same as Goal 1	same as goal 1	teachers and IEP team	same as Goal 1	sameas goal 1				
of im 5E. I satis	d on the analysis of studer aprovement for the following Economically Disadvanta afactory progress in read ding Goal #5E:	g subgroup: ged students not makin		g Questions", identify and	I define areas in nee				
2012	2 Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Expecte	d Level of Performance	:				
na			NA						
	P	roblem-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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus		PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible fc Monitoring
ULS, Enrich, Matrix training,	ESE	District	all teachers	fall and spring	peoplesoft moitoring	principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Mater	ial(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Continue use of ULS	printing teacher made materials	school funds	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
increase the use of communication devices	purchase IPADs	grants	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
na	na	na	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,100.00

End of Reading Goa

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

vvnen using percentages,	include the number	of students the	percentage represents	next to the percentag	je (e.g., 70%)	(35)).
--------------------------	--------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------	--------

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.								
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.								
CELLA Goal #1:								
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:								

	Problem-Solving P	rocess to Inc	crease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Position Respons For Monito	on nsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Su	ıbmitted		•
Students read in English	at grade level text in	a manner sim	ilar to no	on-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring pr	oficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficier	nt in reading:			
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to Inc	crease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Position Respons for Monito	on nsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Su	ıbmitted		•
Students write in English	h at grade level in a m	anner similar t	o non-E	LL students.	
3. Students scoring pr	oficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:					
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficier	nt in writing:			
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to Inc	crease S	Student Achievement	

Person or

Responsible for

Monitoring

No Data Submitted

Position

Strategy

Process Used to

Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Tool

Determine

Anticipated Barrier

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

^ vvne.	n using percentages, include	the number of students the p	perce	entage represents	s (e.g., 70% (35)).				
	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following		efer	ence to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in nee			
math	CAT2.0: Students scoringematics. ematics Goal #1a:	g at Achievement Level :	3 in	Students do not take the FCAT they take the FAA. 75% of the students tested will acjieve in the levels 4-9 on the FA					
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:				
	of the 11 students tested mance levels 4-9 on the F			68%					
	Pr	roblem-Solving Process	to I	L ncrease Studer	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too				
1	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	FAA			
2	NA								
of imp	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following lorida Alternate Assessn ents scoring at Levels 4, ematics Goal #1b:	g group: nent:			dents will achieve at a 4,5				
2012	Current Level of Perforn	mance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:				
4 out	of 6 students tested (67°	% scores at level 4,5,6,)			school students will score the Florida Alternative as				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Studer	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too			
1	6 students wre tested 4 were at level 4, 5 or 6. Difficult for students to move a level in one year	Students IEP goals will reflect appropriate math goals	Tea tea	acher and IEP m	Unique Learning Systems	ULS, FAA			
2	6 students were tested 4 scored at level 4,5,6, Students show gains in IEP goals that are not measured by the FAA	Students IEP goals will continue to reflect appropriate math goals	Tea tea	acher and IEP m	Uniques Learning Systems	UISFAA			
3	I cannot delete the first goal which is innaccurate								
4	Performance of the FAA is impacted by the cognitive functioning level and the other	Teachers will continue to use the ULS and include the appropriate Access ponts in lessons	tea	chers	Classroom observation , lesson plan review	FAA and ULS assessments			

	disabilities of the students								
	on the analysis of s		t achievement data, and g group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
1	AT 2.0: Students 4 in mathematics		ng at or above Achiever	ment	Students take the FAA not the Fcat and the levels are not				
Mathe	ematics Goal #2a:				comparable	e.			
2012	erforr		2013 Exp	ected	d Level of Performa	nce:			
same a	as goal 1				68%				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Antici	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Re				on or ion onsible toring	on Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			uation Tool
			No I	Data :	Submitted	•		•	
	on the analysis of s		t achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
Stude mathe	orida Alternate As nts scoring at or a ematics. ematics Goal #2b:		nent: Achievement Level 7 ir	า					
2012	Current Level of P	erforr	mance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	R	Person o Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1 1	6 students were te One scored level 7	sted .	Continue to write math related IEP goals at the individual level	IEP	team		IEP meetings and achievemnt of goals		FAA and IEP
	on the analysis of s		t achievement data, and g group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
gains	AT 2.0: Percentagin mathematics.	ge of s	tudents making learnir	ng	no sub gro	ups a	all students intellectua	ally di	isabled
2012	Current Level of P	erforr	mance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
NA					NA				

		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Stu	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy		R	Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring		Process Used t Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Too	
1	NA		NA	NA			NA		NA
	on the analysis of sovement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	iding	g Questions", identify	and o	define areas in ne
	orida Alternate As								
	ematics.	Пакп	g Learning Gains in						
<i>M</i> athe	matics Goal #3b:								
viatric	Thaties Godi # 55.								
2012 (Current Level of Po	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performa	nce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Stu	uder	nt Achievement		
									<u> </u>
Australia ataul Danatan			Chashami		Person or Position		Process Used t Determine	0	
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	R	esponsible Monitoring		Effectiveness of Strategy	of	Evaluation To
r (r F E I f t	Students continue to make gains on their IEP goals which are not necessarily tested on the FAA 50% (3 out of 6) made a level gain . It is difficult for students who are ID to make a level gain in a year			n	EP team		goals achievement		IEP meetings UL assessments FA.
	on the analysis of sovement for the fol		achievement data, and	refer	ence to "Gu	iding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in ne
			udents in Lowest 25%						
	g learning gains i								
Mathe	matics Goal #4:				na				
2012 (Current Level of Po	erforn	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
same a	ns 1				68%				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Stu	uder	nt Achievement		
			l c	Perso	on or				
Antici	riticipated Barrier Strategy Pos for		Posit Resp For	esponsible Effe		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
			•		Submitted				

Based	on Amb	itious but A	chieval	ble Annual	Meas	surable (Objec	tives (Al	MOs),	AMO-	-2, F	Reading and M	Math F	Performance Ta	rget
Measu	ırable Ob I will red	but Achieva pjectives (A uce their ac	MOs). I	In six year		dle Scho	ol Ma	themati	cs Goa	al#					2
1	ine data 0-2011	2011-201	2 2	012-2013		2013-20		2014-2015			2015-2016		2016-201	17	
		analysis of s			ent d	ata, and	d refe	rence to	"Guid	ding C	Quest	tions", identif	y and	I define areas ir	n nee
5B. S Hispa satisf	tudent s inic, Asia actory p	subgroups an, Americ progress ir Goal #5B:	by eth an Ind	nicity (Wh				no sub	ogroup)S					
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:							2013	Exped	cted L	_eve	I of Perform	ance	:	
na								na							
			Pr	oblem-Sol	ving	Proces	s to I	ncreas	se Stu	dent	Ach	ievement			
	Anticipated Barrier Stra		rate			Posi Respons	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			Evaluation	Tool		
1	NA			NA			NA				NA			NA	
of imp 5C. En	nglish La actory p	analysis of some standard section in the following anguage Loprogress in Goal #5C:	llowing earner n math	subgroup: s (ELL) no			d refe	nence to	"Guid	ding C	Ques	tions", identif	y and	define areas ir	n nee
2012	Current	Level of P	erform	nance:				2013	Exped	cted L	_eve	l of Perform	ance	:	
No su	b groups							NA							
			Pr	oblem-Sol	ving	Proces	s to I	ncreas	e Stu	dent	Ach	ievement			
Antic	ipated E	3arrier	Strate	egy			Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	e [E	Deter	mine	sed to e ness of	Ev	aluation Tool	
						No	Data	Submitt	ed						

			1					
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress ir	oilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #5D:								
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	ticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp for		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No	Data S	Submitted					
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, and Ilowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need			
5E. Economically Disado satisfactory progress ir Mathematics Goal #5E:	vantaged students not maki n mathematics.	ing	no sub groups					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
NA			NA					
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No	Data S	Submitted					
				_				
				Fnd of M	iddle School Mathematics Go			

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 defining need of improvement for the following group:					
		Students will continue to show gains on meeting their IEP goals. 40% will score in levels 4,5,and 6 on the FAA			
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		The IEP team will continue to write the appropriate math goals for each student	IEP team teacher	9	ULS assessments and IEP goals assesment
2	FAA is impacted by the students cognitive, and in many cases physical,	to use the ULS	Teachers	Classtoom observations lesson plans	ULS FAA

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:

or above	a Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at ELEVEL 7 in mathematics. atics Goal #2:	Students will continue to make progress towards their IEP math related goals. 25 % will achieve at level 7 on the FAA
2012 Cur	rrent Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3 student 2011/201	is were tested 0% scored at a level 7 on the 2 FAA	On the 2012/2013 FAA 25% of the students tested will score on a level 7 on the Florida Alternative Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The system is transposing data and will not allow me to delte the above incorrect record!				
2		Teachers will continue to use the ULS curriculum	Teachers	ULS assessments	ULS FAA
3		When appropriate, the team should include atrategies and goals for both short and long term achievemnt in Math	IEP team	teacher assesments ULS	ULS and FAA IEP goals assesment

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

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

Students will continue to make gains on both short and long IEP goals. 50% will show a level gain on the FAA

Mathematics Goal #3:

2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
44% (4 out9 tested) had a gain of 1 or more levels from the 2010/2011 to 2011/2012 FAA			mshow at least	On the 2012/2013 FAA50% of the students tested will mshow at least a 1 level gain from 2012 to 2013 as measured by the FAA.			
	Prol	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	Performance on the FAA is often impacted by the cognitive and physical disabilities of the students. It is difficult for them to be constistent with responses.	Continue to use the ULS and write long and short term IEP math goals as appropriate	IEP team teachers	IEP team monitoring	ULS FAA		

Algebra End-of-Cou				200 (2F))	
* When using percentages,	include the number of s	students the perc	ептаде герге	esenis (e.g., 70% (35)).	
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		data, and refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee
1. Students scoring at a	Achievement Level	3 in Algebra.			
Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease St	udent 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 refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee
of improvement for the for	ollowing group:	· 	1		
2. Students scoring at and 5 in Algebra.	or above Achievem	ent Levels 4			
Algebra Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:

Anticipated Barrier Strategy		Perso Positi Respo for Monit		ion onsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evalu	uation Tool	
			No	!	Submitted	1			
Based on Ambi	tious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable (Objecti	ves (AMOs), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ıth Per	formance Target
	jectives (Al	ible Annual MOs). In six year hievement gap	Algebra Goa	al #					_
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016		2016-2017
		student achievem	ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and de	efine areas in need
	an, America rogress in	by ethnicity (Whan Indian) not n Algebra.							
2012 Current	Level of Po	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to Ir	ncrease St	tudent Ach	ilevement		
Anticipated B	arrier	Strategy		for	IPPOCASS LISAN TO			ation Tool	
			No	Data S	Submitted				
Pacad on the	unalysis of	tudont ochisus	ont data acc	d rofee	once +a #C	ilding Our	tions" identify	and d	ofino areas in the
		lowing subgroup:	ent uata, and	u reiere	ence to Gl	ulaing Ques	auons , identify	and de	efine areas in need
3C. English La satisfactory p		earners (ELL) no Algebra.	t making						
Algebra Goal	#3C:								
2012 Current	Level of Po	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to Ir	ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement		

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of softimprovement for the following the following the following the same of the following the same of the following the same of	student achievement data, and Ilowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
3D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	ilities (SWD) not making Algebra.					
Algebra Goal #3D:						
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	ance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the following the following the following the same of the same of the following the same of	student achievement data, and llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need	
3E. Economically Disady satisfactory progress in	vantaged students not maki n Algebra.	ing				
Algebra Goal #3E:						
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	udent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy R		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data :	Submitted			

End of Algebra EOC Go:

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

Based on the analin need of improve					and	d reference to	o "Guid	ing Questions", id	lent	tify and define areas
1. Students scori Geometry.	ing at	Achieven	nent L	evel 3 in						
Geometry Goal #	1:									
2012 Current Lev	/el of	Performa	nce:			2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nan	ice:
		Problem	n-Solv	ing Proces	s to	Increase S	tudent	t Achievement		
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy			Po Re for	rson or sition sponsible onitoring	Deter	iveness of	Ev	aluation Tool
				No	Dat	ta Submitted	•		•	
Based on the analin need of improve					and	d reference to	o "Guid	ing Questions", id	lent	tify and define areas
2. Students score 4 and 5 in Geome		or above	Achie	evement Le	evel	S				
Geometry Goal #	2:									
2012 Current Lev	el of	Performa	nce:			2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perform	nan	ice:
		Problem	n-Solv	ing Proces	s to	Increase S	tudent	t Achievement		
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy			Po Re for	rson or sition sponsible - onitoring	Deter	iveness of	Ev	aluation Tool
				No	Dat	ta Submitted				
Based on Ambitiou Target	ıs but	Achievable	Annu	ıal Measural	ole (Objectives (A	MOs),	AMO-2, Reading a	and	Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yea reduce their achie 50%.	e Obje ar scho	ctives ool will	Geom	netry Goal #						×
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016		2016-2017

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

3B. Student subgroup Hispanic, Asian, Amer satisfactory progress	ican Indian) not mak				
Geometry Goal #3B:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement			reference to	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3C. English Language satisfactory progress		naking			
Geometry Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ехр	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement			reference to	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress		naking			
Geometry Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Droblom Solving D	Process to I	nerease S	itudent Achievement	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible 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 need of improvement for the following subgroup:							
_	dvantaged students not						
making satisfactory p	rogress in Geometry.						
Geometry Goal #3E:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No Data Submitted						

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade	and/or DLC	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide)		Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ULS	all bands	District	school-wide	pre-school		SIR and principal

Mathematics Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
increase use of manipulatives	teacher made and purchased materials	school funds	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
use of the IPAD as a manipulative	purchase IPADs	grants	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00

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
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,100.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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 scor I 3 in science. nce Goal #1a:	ing at Achievement	Students do n with the FAA.	Students do not take the FCAT . They are assessed with the FAA.			
2012	Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:		
	(6) of the 8students test e FAA these are the achi		87%	87%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Smallnumber of students tested affects the ability to arrive at the percentage of increase	NA	NA	NA	NA		
2	Performance on the FAA is impacted by the students cognitive and physical disbilities. It is difficult to get consistent responses.		Teachers	classroom observance	Unique Learning Systems FAA		

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:	Students will continue to show progress towards meeting their short and long term IEP goals related to science				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
3 students were tested 2 scored a level 7 and one scored a 3	With only 3 students tested it is difficult to project accurately a percentage gain . We have only 1 student who will be tested in HS science this year.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3 middle school students were tested 2 scored at level 5 Difficult to change percents with such small numbers	Continue to use UIs Curriculum	Teacher and IEP team	ULS	ULS FAA
2	the above sentence is incorrect The system will not allow me to correct it				
3	3 High school students were tested 2 scored a 7 and one scored a 3	1	teacher and the iep team	ULS	ULS and FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. NA Science Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: NΑ see goal one Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy NA NΑ NA NΑ NA

1	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
Studi in sci	lorida Alternate Asses ents scoring at or abovi ience. nce Goal #2b:	sment: ve Achievement Level	Students will c	Students will continue to show progress towards meeting their short and long term science goals when applicable .			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
3 students were tested on the 2011/2012 FAA, one (33%) score at level 7 or above				35% of students tested with the 2012/2013 FAA will score at level 7 or above.			
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1	3 students were tested 1 scored a level		IEP meetings and goals achievemnt	FAA and IEP
ľ	7	marviadar coronico geare	dome v omme	

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:				Students will continue to make gains towards achieving short and long IEP goals related to science.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performand	ce:	
3 students tested none scored at this level on the 2011/2012				25% of the students tested will score in level 4,5,and 6 on the 2012/2013 FAA			
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o I n	ncrease Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1		Continue to use the ULS curriculum and include Accesspoints in lessons	Teachers		classroom observance	Unique Learning Systems FAA	

1	d on the analysis of stud in need of improvement			Guiding Questions", ide	ntify and define	
at or	orida Alternate Assess above Level 7 in scier nce Goal #2:		Students will of	Students will continue to show progress towards meeting their short and long term IEP goals related to science		
2012	Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:	
	3 students were tested 2 scored a level 7 and one scored a 3			With only 3 students tested it is difficult to project accurately a percentage gain . We have only 1 student who will be tested in HS science this year.		
	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	the above sentence is incorrect The system will not allow me to correct it					
2	3 High school students were tested 2 scored a 7 and one scored a 3	ULS curriculum which	teacher and the lep team	ULS	ULS and FAA	

_			_
	FAA		
	when applicable write	<u>)</u>	
	science IEP goals		

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

	ased on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define reas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position		on or tion oonsible 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	(e.g., PLC,	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers continue to attend all ULS training	all HS	District	school wide	ongoing	SIR and Principal	principal

Science Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
continue use of ULS curriculum	printing teacher made materials	school funds	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
「echnology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
		_	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			\$0.00
	_		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$200.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas n need of improvement for the following group:				
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students do not take the FCAT writing they are tested using the FAA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
40% (2 students) of the 5 students tested achieved the achieved or commended level	50%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	number of students tested in the lower spectrum of disability	cpntinue use Of ULS	teachers IEP team	ULS assessments	ULS assessments

	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the	ent achievement data, ar e following group:	nd reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:			Students will cachieving their	Students will continue to show progress towards achieving their IEP goals related to writing and continue to score at or above level 4 on the FAA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	d Level of Performanc	e:	
3 students were tested on the 2011/2012 FAA 100% scored level 4 or higher			100% will score	100% will score level 4 or higher on the 2012/2013 FAA		
	Prol	blem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	The cognitive and physical disabilites of the students impacts the consistency of performance on the FAA. Maintaining 100% performance at this level may be difficult.	Continue to write IEP goals related to Writing where appropriate. Continue to use the ULS	teacher and IEP team	Uls IEP team	FAA	

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
Unique Learning Systems training is available throughtout the year	all grades (bands)	District	school-wide	throughout the year	classroom observations and review of lesson plans	SIR and Principal

Writing Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional 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 Writing Goals

Civics 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 in need of improvement			reference t	o "Guiding Questions",	, identify and define areas
1. Students scoring a	t Achievement L	evel 3 in Civics			
Civics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process 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		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in Civics.			
Civics Goal #2:			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

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

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						

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 reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

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

History.						
U.S. History Goal #1:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
	·	·	·			

Based on the analysis o in need of improvement		ta, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Questions"	identify and define areas	
2. Students scoring at	or above Achievement	Levels				
4 and 5 in U.S. History	4 and 5 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position for		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	No Data Submitted					

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

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

U.S. History 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 U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

	Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. Att	tendance		All students are	All students are intellectually disadbled and many are			
Attendance Goal #1:				enged as well. Long tern	9		
2012 Current Attendance Rate:			2013 Expecte	d Attendance Rate:			
90.51%			93%	93%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
4			1	1			
ı	Current Number of Stues (10 or more)	udents with Excessive		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
	idents are door to door bal appointment	oussed so only tardy if fo	r none if no illnes	none if no illnesses			
	Prok	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		

medical conditions of students none Principal monitor excuses for tardies attendar records	nce
--	-----

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(3)/ Waterial(3)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	We do not have suspensions			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			

NA			NA	NA			
2012	Total Number of Stude	nts Suspended In-Scho	2013 Expecte School	d Number of Students	Suspended In-		
NA			NA	NA			
			2013 Expecte Suspensions	d Number of Out-of-Sc	hool		
NA			NA	NA			
2012 School		ents Suspended Out-of-	2013 Expecte of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			
NA			NA	NA			
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	na	na	na	na	na		

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define area in need of improvement:						and define areas
1. Dr	opout Prevention					
·			5	Our students may stay until the are age 22 . Studentsfrequently come back after graduation but deccide not to stay until 22.		
2012	Current Dropout Rate:		2	2013 Expected	d Dropout Rate:	
0			C	0		
2012	Current Graduation Ra	te:	2	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
100%	who were eligible		1	100%		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to In	crease Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Matorial(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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, an in need of improvement:	d reference to "Guid	ling Questions", identify	and define areas			
1. Parent Involvement						
Parent I nvolvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	the percentage of their student	Parent Involvement goal will be achieved by measurin the percentageof parents who take part in the planni of their students goals and curriculm. In 2009/2010 71 the parents were involved in the process				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
In 2011 we exceeded our goal 75% with 84% participation	87%					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
	Person or	Process Used to				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	parental involvement in this setting. Not only is it important to have parent involvent,	are scheduled. We provide every possible alternative, including phone conferencing to assist parents in being involved.	Teachers and Principal	record keeping	record keeping

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	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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Pro	gram(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Continue use of ULS	printing teacher made materials	school funds	\$100.00
Mathematics	increase use of manipulatives	teacher made and purchased materials	school funds	\$100.00
Science	continue use of ULS curriculum	printing teacher made materials	school funds	\$200.00
				Subtotal: \$400.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	increase the use of communication devices	purchase IPADs	grants	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	use of the IPAD as a manipulative	purchase IPADs	grants	\$2,000.00
Science				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$4,000.00
Professional Develo	pment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	na	na	na	\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$4,400.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

	jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	j m NA	
--	-------------	----------	------------	---------------	--

Are you a reward school: j'n Yes j'n No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



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

Our charter school is extremely small so our Charter school Board serves in both capacities as it is more diverse .

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The Board serves as head of various smaller committees which are made of of parents who are willing to serve on short term basis.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found