FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PALM BEACH VIRTUAL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Debra P. Johnson, B.F.A., M.S.

SAC Chair: Cynthia Schaub, B.A., B.A., M.A., M.Ed.

Superintendent: E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012



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	Debra Johnson	Principal/Ed. Leadership	3	18	*Florida Virtual School Franchise no grade in year 1; *Don Estridge High Tech Middle School A rated and met AYP during tenure there; *Loggers Run Middle School went up from a C to B first year there, then went up to an A for the second and third year during tenure there

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.

Prior Performance Record (include
prior School Grades FCAT/Statewide

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	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	Virtual Instruction Program (VIP 7001). In Palm Beach, the two providers are K12 and Connections Academy. The teachers are hired, developed and evaluated by the	K12, LLC Leadership Connections Academy Leadership	ongoing	None are District employees.

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
12	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	100.0%(12)	0.0%(0)	100.0%(12)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

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

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, nutriprograms, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.
Title I, Part A
N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
N/A
Title I, Part D
N/A
Title II
N/A
Title III
N/A
Title X- Homeless
N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
N/A
Violence Prevention Programs
District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.
Nutrition Programs
N/A
Housing Programs
N/A
Head Start
N/A
Adult Education
N/A
Career and Technical Education
N/A
Job Training
N/A
Other
N/A
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
School-based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
Principal RtI LEA Teacher/Reading Support teacher Instructional Specialist

Guidance Specialist

Teachers participation on rotation and during their students' status reviews

There are no assistant principals or coaches at this school

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?

As this is a small school, all students are closely monitored.

The School Based RtI Leadership Team (SBT) is scheduled for weekly meetings to review the progress of students and to review the records and performance of students who are not on pace.

When students demonstrate challenges at their academic level, the student is referred to a school-based team by any member of the faculty. The SBT LEA brings data and records to the meeting to discuss the student and determine next steps. Recommendations are made during the team meeting. The outcomes of the meeting are shared with all faculty and staff involved and with the parent in the form of notes, recommendations and time-specific interventions. Progress monitoring continues at SBT meetings.

RtI processes are followed along the continum of intervention services. The SBT LEA monitors all students demonstrating challenges in the area of academic readiness or performance at their appropriate grade level.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The SBT members are the school leadership team and will all be members of the SAC. This team brings the data, trends and academic recommendations to the council and facilitates the development and monitoring of the plan through the RtI processes.

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.

Scholastic Reading Inventory

Maze

Diagnostics

Palm Beach Writes

FCAT

Educational Data Warehouse

FLDOE data

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Faculty Meetings in September, October and February.

Ongoing support through the RtI Leadership Team meeting outcomes, teacher participation, recommendations and monitoring.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

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

K12,LLC

Debra Johnson (District)

Brenda McDonald (K12)

Gila Tuchman (K12) Lori Hill (K12)

Connections Academy
Debra Johnson (District)
Sally Fernandez (Connections Academy)

Patricia Brooke (Connections Academy)

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

School-based Literacy Leadership Teams ensure reading and literacy are a focus across all content areas by conducting ongoing meetings to address concerns and patterns across courses and students. The teams evaluate growth of students in reading, based on data provided through assessment sources.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to ensure that ongoing professional development is utilized for the best interest of all students in all grades by meeting frequently to strengthen reading strategies across all content areas.

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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The LLT has put into place initiatives to ensure that all content area teachers are addressing the literacy needs of every student. The lowest 25% of readers, as well as all other students are provided support with varied instructional strategies and differentiated instruction for each target group.

*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?

The students are offered varied courses to introduce students to work related skills. There are academic track courses as electives that support career readiness. Students are provided the support of the guidance counselor to discuss appropriate course tracks and skill preparation required to ensure success in the post secondary environment of their choice. Students are encouraged to take the PSAT, the SAT, the ACT, and the ASVAB.

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 guidance counselor in the spring and summer to plan for their next year including course selection and scholarship.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School

Feedback Report

 $Increased \ support \ to \ students \ regarding \ dual-enrollment \ opportunities \ is \ planned.$

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading 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:							
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:				Meet the AMO targets for 2013.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expected	Level of Performance:			
58% of students achieved level 3 or above in reading.				All subgroups will meet or exceed 2013 AMO targets.				
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	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	Falling Short of Goal.	Target Reading, Writing, Math, and Science Learning Skills for All Students.	LLT RtI Tea IL		LTMs (Learning Team Meetings) and Data- Based Discussions	Diagnostic Tools SRI FCAT EOCs		
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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:								
	Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Expect	ed Level of Performance:				
	Pr	oblem-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	Virtual Students are resistant to standardized testing due to various reasons.	Follow strategies of state-wide school in charge of overall curriculum and instruction.	Principal	Monitoring of Progress Reports and Data from Students Attending Testing Sessions.	Test Results			

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

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

	l 4 in reading. ing Goal #2a:		Students will m	Students will meet AMO goals for 2013.			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:			
ND			All subgroups w	All subgroups will meet or exceed 2013 AMO targets.			
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Not maintaining current high levels of proficiency.	Enhance all content areas with higher order thinking skills through every content area.	Principal and Teachers	Parent / Teacher / Administrator Conferences based on Reports	Diagnostics FCAT SRI EOC		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Virtual School Families Follow strategies of Principal and Monitoring Progress Diagnostics state-wide school in Reports of Students FAIR resist standardized Teachers charge of overall SRI testing for various Attending Testing reasons. curriculum and Sessions. Other measures 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:							
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Students will reach current proficiency goals for 2013 by maintaining level (3 or above) or increasing learning gains by one year's growth.						
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
69% of students made learning gains in reading.	Meet AMO reading target for 2013.						
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Person or Proc	ess Used to					

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	o .	Online Tutoring Sessions for Students Predicted to Score below proficiency.	and Language Arts	of Individual Student	Diagnostics Alternative Assessments

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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Principal and **FAIR** Virtual School Families Follow strategies of Monitoring of data are resistant to state-wide school in Teachers reports from students SRI standardized testing. charge of overall attending testing Diagnostics curriculum and sessions. Other measures 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: 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Students in lowest 25% will increase to next level in reading or make one year's growth. Reading Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 58% of students in the lowest 25% made gains in reading. Meet AMO reading target for 2013.

	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	Falling short of Goal	One on One Online Tutoring in critical areas (Math, Reading, Science, Writing) for all lowest 25% students.		Assessment process of RtI team and ongoing discussion for individual students at-risk.	Comparison data between Fall and Winter diagnostic testing. Running records of individual teachers from tutoring sessions.					

				Reading Goal #	<i>‡</i>				
		but Achievable ojectives (AMOs		Meet AMO	rea	ding target f	or 20	13 in all subgro	ups.
		uce their achie							
by 50°	%.			5A :					7
Pacol	ine data			071.]					
1)-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-201	4	2014-201	5	2015-2016	2016-2017
		58	82	84		85		87	
						,		·	
		analysis of stud nt for the follow			efere	nce to "Guiding	Quest	tions", identify and o	define areas in need
<u> </u>									
I		subgroups by e an, American I	_						
		progress in rea		naking			ng all	ethnicities of studer	nts will increase
			3		1	10%.			
Readi	ng Goal	#5B:							
2012	Current	Level of Perfo	ormance:		2	2013 Expected	d Leve	I of Performance:	
Ameri	can India	n. NA							
Asian:		III. IVA							
Black:					ľ	Meet AMO readi	ing tar	get for 2013.	
White	nic: 25% : 18%								
			Problem-Sol	lvina Process 1	o I n	crease Studer	nt Ach	ievement	
						Person or	Р	rocess Used to	
	Antic	ipated Barrier	St	rategy	P.o	Position sponsible for	F:	Determine ffectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
						Monitoring		Strategy	
		s from poverty				cipal and		ess Monitoring and	Anecdotal Records
1		e most problem ng progress in		students using the RtI process and taking into		Teachers		ant Communication Parents and	Performance Assessments
	school.	school. This is especially account the					Stude		Standardized
		a virtual program		each student.		_			Assessments
	Not Mee	ting Goals		oring Session ents in critical	RtI	Team		ing Team ssions surrounding	Diagnostic Comparison
2			areas (rea	ding, math,				nt goal.	Companison
			science, w	riting)					
		analysis of stud nt for the follow			efere	nce to "Guiding	Quest	tions", identify and o	define areas in need
5C. Er	nglish La	anguage Learr	ners (ELL) no	ot making					
satisf	actory p	progress in rea	ading.						
Poadi	ng Goal	#5C:			ľ	Meet AMO targe	ets for	2013.	
Reaui	rig Goai	#50.							
2012	Current	Level of Perfo	ormance.		,	2013 Evpector	11000	I of Performance:	
2012	Juitell	LOVOI OI F CIT	ormanice.		4		, LCVC	. or r crioi mance.	
N/A					N	Meet AMO targe	ets for	2013.	
			Problem-So	lving Process t	to I n	crease Studer	nt Ach	ievement	
						Person or	Р	rocess Used to	
	Antio	inated Barrier	· C+	rategy		Position	"	Determine	Evaluation Tool
	AIILIC	ipated Barrier	51	rategy		sponsible for	E:	ffectiveness of	Lvaluation 1001
	FILS no	ed additional	Follow str	ategies of the	_	Monitoring cipal and	Progr	Strategy ess Monitoring	CELLA
1	support	(time, simplifie		and instruction			rrogre	WOUTOUTING	Formal and
	text, etc	c.)	_	e program.					Informal Testing
	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A

of imp	provement for the following	subgroup:					
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:				Meet AMO targets for 2013.			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:	2	2013 Expected	Level of Performance:		
N/A				Meet AMO targe	ets for 2013.		
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to I n	crease Studer	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Students with disabilities need individualized help. In virtual school those individualized supports need to be shared with parent and scaffolded by teachers.	Follow curriculum and instruction program supports provided.		cipal and chers	Progress Monitoring	Formal and Informal Data Reports	
2	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
	on the analysis of studen provement for the following	t achievement data, and re	efere	nce to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in need	
satisf	conomically Disadvantag factory progress in readi ing Goal #5E:	ged students not making ng.		Meet AMO targe	ets for 2013.		
2012	Current Level of Perform	nance:	2	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
38%				Meet AMO targets for 2013.			
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	to I n	crease Studer	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

Constant communication Principal and

between Teacher /

Administrator.

N/A

Teachers

N/A

Anecdotal reports on

N/A

individual students noted. Informal

Formal and

N/A

Assessment and

Conversation Logs

Economically

schoolwork.

N/A

disadvantaged students

are adults to help them

through various life hurdles so they can concentrate on their

need to know that there Parent / Student /

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

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

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

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

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Prograr	m(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 Developme	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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.					
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					

	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data Submitted		
Students read in English	at grade level text in a ma	nner similar to no	on-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring pr	oficient in reading.			
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in r	reading:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data Submitted		
Students write in English	n at grade level in a manner	similar to non-E	LL students.	
3. Students scoring pr	roficient in writing.			
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in v	writing:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data Submitted		

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 CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based of imp	d on the analysis of studen provement for the following	t achievement data, and r g group:	efer	ence to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need
	CAT2.0: Students scoring ematics.	g at Achievement Level	3 in			
Math	ematics Goal #1a:					
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Studei	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Falling Short of Goal.	Target Reading, Writing, Math, and Science Learning Skills for All Students.	LLT RtI Tea IL		LTMs (Learning Team Meetings) and Data- Based Discussions	Diagnostic Tools SRI FCAT EOCs
Math	ents scoring at Levels 4, ematics Goal #1b:		S.			
2012	Current Level of Perforn	nance:		2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Studei	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Virtual Students are resistant to standardized testing due to various reasons.	Follow strategies of state-wide school in charge of overall curriculum and instruction.	Prir	ncipal	Monitoring of Progress Reports and Data from Students Attending Testing Sessions.	Test Results
	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following		efer	ence to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #2a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Not maintaining current high levels of proficiency.	Enhance all content areas with higher order thinking skills through every content area.	Principal and Teachers	Parent / Teacher / Administrator Conferences based on Reports	Diagnostics FCAT SRI EOC		

	on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and o	define areas in need
Stude math	ematics.	nent: Achievement Level 7 in			
viatne	ematics Goal #2b:				
2012	Current Level of Perforr	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	Pr	oblem-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	Virtual School Families resist standardized testing for various reasons.	Follow strategies of state-wide school in charge of overall curriculum and instruction.	Principal and Teachers	Monitoring Progress Reports of Students Attending Testing Sessions.	Diagnostics FAIR SRI Other measures

	reasons.	instruction.		Sessions.	Other measures	
	on the analysis of studen provement for the following	t achievement data, and re g group:	eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in need	
	CAT 2.0: Percentage of s in mathematics.	tudents making learning)			
Math	ematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	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	Falling Short of Goals	Online Tutoring Sessions for Students Predicted to Score below proficiency.	All Math, Reading, and Language Arts Teachers and RtI Team	Review of Assessments of Individual Student Progress	Diagnostics Alternative Assessments	

	d on the analysis of studer provement for the following	nt achievement data, and r g group:	eference to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need
Perce	lorida Alternate Assessr entage of students makii nematics.				
Math	ematics Goal #3b:				
2012	Current Level of Perform	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	Pi	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	Virtual School Families are resistant to standardized testing.	Follow strategies of state-wide school in charge of overall curriculum and instruction.	Principal and Teachers	Monitoring of data reports from students attending testing sessions.	FAIR SRI Diagnostics Other measures
4. FC.	provement for the following AT 2.0: Percentage of st ng learning gains in mat ematics Goal #4:	udents in Lowest 25%			
2012	Current Level of Perform	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	Pı	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	Falling short of Goal	One on One Online Tutoring in critical areas (Math, Reading, Science, Writing) for all lowest 25% students.	Reading, Math, Science teachers. RtI Team	Assessment process of RtI team and ongoing discussion for individual students at-risk.	Comparison data between Fall and Winter diagnostic testing. Running records of individual teachers from tutoring sessions.
Basec	d on Ambitious but Achieva	able Annual Measurable Ob			erformance Target
Measu	mbitious but Achievable Alurable Objectives (AMOs). If will reduce their achieven. %.	nnual In six year	thool Mathematics G	Soal #	A

Baseline data

2010-2011

2011-2012

2012-2013

2013-2014

2014-2015

2015-2016

2016-2017

	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need
5B. S Hispa satist	tudent subgroups by ethanic, Asian, American I no factory progress in math ematics Goal #5B:	nnicity (White, Black, dian) not making			
2012	Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	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	in making progress in school. This is especially	Follow the progress of all students using the RtI process and taking into account the individual needs of each student.		Progress Monitoring and Constant Communication with Parents and Students	Anecdotal Records Performance Assessments Standardized Assessments
satis	nglish Language Learner factory progress in math ematics Goal #5C:	_			
2012	Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
	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	ELLs need additional support (time, simplified text, etc.)	Follow strategies of the curriculum and instruction team of the program.	Principal and Teachers	Progress Monitoring	CELLA Formal and Informal Testing
	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guidino	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need
5D. S	tudents with Disabilities factory progress in math	(SWD) not making			
Math	ematics Goal #5D:				
2012	Current Level of Perform	nance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1	Students with disabilities need individualized help. In virtual school those individualized supports need to be shared with parent and scaffolded by teachers.	instruction program supports provided.	Principal and Teachers	Progress Monitoring	Formal and Informal Data Reports			

ı	I on the analysis of studen provement for the following		eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and c	define areas in need	
	conomically Disadvantaç factory progress in math	_	J			
Math	ematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	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	Economically disadvantaged students need to know that there are adults to help them through various life hurdles so they can concentrate on their schoolwork.	Constant communication between Teacher / Parent / Student / Administrator.	Principal and Teachers	Anecdotal reports on individual students noted.	Formal and Informal Assessment and Conversation Logs	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and referons of improvement for the following group:	ence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	
Mathematics Goal #1a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to I	ncrease Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		3, 3, 3,	RtI	Meetings) and Data- Based Discussions	Diagnostic Tools SRI FCAT EOCs

	provement for the follo	mig group.				
	Torida Alternate Asse ents scoring at Level		ematics.			
Math	nematics Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expect	ed Level of Performa	nce:
		Droblem Solving D	rocoss to l	percess Stud	ont Achievement	
		Problem-Solving Pr	ocess to i	ncrease stud	ent Achievement	
Antio	cipated Barrier S	trategy	Posit Resp for	ponsible De	ocess Used to etermine fectiveness of rategy	Evaluation Tool
			No Data	Submitted		
	d on the analysis of stu provement for the follo		a, and refer	rence to "Guidii	ng Questions", identify	and define areas in need
	CAT 2.0: Students sc I 4 in mathematics.	oring at or above Act	nievement			
Math	nematics Goal #2a:					
2012	2 Current Level of Per	formance:		2013 Expect	ed Level of Performa	nce:
2012	? Current Level of Per	formance:		2013 Expect	ed Level of Performa	nce:
2012	Current Level of Per	formance:		2013 Expect	ed Level of Performa	nce:
2012	? Current Level of Per	formance: Problem-Solving Pr	rocess to I			nce:
2012	2 Current Level of Per	Problem-Solving Pr			ent Achievement Process Used t Determine	TO Evaluation Tool

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.

					+				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy			Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ctiveness of itegy	Eval	luation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted				
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	refer	rence to "Gu	ıiding	Questions", identify	and (define areas in need
gains	in mathematics.	e of s	tudents making learnii	ng					
	ematics Goal #3a: Current Level of Pe	orforn	nanco:		2012 Evp	octos	Level of Performar	200:	
	odirent level of the		nance.		ZO TO EXP				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barı	rier	Strategy	R	Person o Position Responsible Monitorin		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	Falling Short of Goa	ls	Online Tutoring Session for Students Predicted Score below proficiency	to an . Te	All Math, Read		Review of Assessmer of Individual Student Progress		Diagnostics Alternative Assessments
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	refer	rence to "Gu	ıiding	Questions", identify	and (define areas in need
Perce	orida Alternate As entage of students ematics.		nent: ng Learning Gains in						
Math	ematics Goal #3b:								
2012	Current Level of Pe	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performar	nce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strat		Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ctiveness of Itegy	Eval	luation Tool

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Mathematics Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

Nο	Data	Subm	itted

Based on the analysis of studer of improvement for the following		eference to "Guiding	Questions", identify and	define areas in need
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of st				
making learning gains in ma	thematics.			
Mathematics Goal #4:				
2012 Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
Р	roblem-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
Falling short of Goal	One on One Online Tutoring in critical areas (Math, Reading, Science, Writing) for all lowest 25% students.	Reading, Math, Science teachers. RtI Team	Assessment process of RtI team and ongoing discussion for individual students at-risk.	Comparison data between Fall and Winter diagnostic testing. Running records of individual teachers from tutoring sessions.
Based on Ambitious but Achieva				erformance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achievable A Measurable Objectives (AMOs). school will reduce their achieve by 50%.	nnual In six year	Mathematics Goal #	<u>:</u>	_
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013 2013-201	4 2014-201	5 2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of studer of improvement for the following		eference to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	define areas in need
5B. Student subgroups by et Hispanic, Asian, American In satisfactory progress in mat	hnicity (White, Black, dian) not making			
Mathematics Goal #5B:				
2012 Current Level of Perform	mance:	2013 Expected	d Level of Performance:	
P	roblem-Solving Process	to Increase Studer	nt Achievement	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of improvement for the		data, and refere	ence to "C	Suiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in ne
5C. English Language satisfactory progress		naking			
Mathematics Goal #5	C:				
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to Ir	ncrease S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making

Mathematics Goal #5E:

satisfactory progress in mathematics.

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
				End (of Middle School Mathematics Goa
orida Alternate /	Assessment High	School Matl	hematic	s Goals	

				ı	End of Middle School Mathem
Florida Alternate A	Assessment High Sc	:hool N	lathema	itics Goals	
* When using percentages,	include the number of stud	lents the p	percentage i	represents next to the per	centage (e.g., 70% (35)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	student achievement date for the following group:	ta, and r	eference to	g "Guiding Questions", id	dentify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate As Levels 4, 5, and 6 in m	ssessment: Students sco nathematics.	oring at			
Mathematics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	cess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	student achievement dat for the following group:	ta, and r	eference to	g "Guiding Questions", i	dentify and define areas
2. Florida Alternate As or above Level 7 in ma	ssessment: Students sco athematics.	oring at			
Mathematics Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
	Troblem-Solving Proc	css IU II	i ici ease 3	tadent Achievenient	

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	student achievement data, for the following group:	and re	eference to	"Guiding Questions", id	entify and define areas
3. Florida Alternate As making learning gains Mathematics Goal #3:	sessment: Percent of studing in mathematics.	dents			
2012 Current Level of	Performance:	:	2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	stoIn	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data S	ubmitted		

Algebra 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 Algebra. Algebra 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

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

of improvement for the f	following group:					
2. Students scoring at and 5 in Algebra.	or above Achievemen	t Levels 4				
Algebra Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performai	nce:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process l Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted			
Based on Ambitious but	Achievable Annual Measu	urable Objecti	ives (AMOs	s), AMO-2,	Reading and Ma	ath Performance Target
3A. Ambitious but Achie Measurable Objectives (school will reduce their a by 50%.	vable Annual AMOs). In six year	ora Goal #				<u></u>
Baseline data 2011-20	012 2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015 2015-2		2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of improvement for the f		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define areas in need
3B. Student subgroups	s by ethnicity (White, E can Indian) not makin					
Algebra Goal #3B:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ехр	ected Leve	el of Performaı	nce:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process l Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evaluation Tool
		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 subgroup:

i e					
3C. English Language satisfactory progress		making			
Algebra Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
		Perso Posit		Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for	onsible toring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of improvement for the f		t data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress		making			
Algebra Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	nance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
			on or	Process Used to	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for	toring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			Submitted		<u>'</u>
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		t data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
3E. Economically Disa satisfactory progress	_	s not making			
Algebra Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	nance:
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-	Course (EOC) Goa	ls			
* When using percentages	s, include the number of s	tudents the	percentage	represents (e.g., 70% (3	35)).
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Students scoring a Geometry.	t Achievement Level 3	3 in			
Geometry Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving Pr	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 of in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
2. Students scoring a4 and 5 in Geometry.	t or above Achieveme	nt Levels			
Geometry Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solving Pr	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 Ambitiou Target	us but	Achievable	Annual Measural	ble Ob	ojectives (A	MOs),	AMO-2, Reading a	and Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six yeareduce their achie 50%.	e Obje ar scho	ctives ool will	Geometry Goal #					_
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2013-2014 2014-2015 2015-2016					2016-2017
Based on the anal				and i	reference t	o "Guid	ing Questions", id	dentify and define areas
3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, satisfactory prog Geometry Goal #	Ameri gress	can India	n) not making	ck,				
2012 Current Lev		Performa	nce:		2013 Exp	pected	Level of Perforn	nance:
		Problem	n-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	student	t Achievement	
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy		Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Evaluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted			
Based on the anal	vsis of	student a	chievement data	and i	reference t	o "Guid	ing Questions" in	dentify and define areas
in need of improve 3C. English Lang satisfactory prog	ement uage l	for the foll Learners	owing subgroup: (ELL) not making			- Guid	ing educations , is	activity and activity areas
Geometry Goal #	±3C:							
2012 Current Lev	vel of	Performa	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perforn	nance:
		Problem	n-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	student	Achievement	
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy		Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3D:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solvir	ig Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi: Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
	of student achievem	ent data, and r	eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas

3	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:					
3E. Economically Disa making satisfactory p	ndvantaged students not progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3E:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	o Data	Submitted			

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1	d on the analysis of studes in need of improvement			Guiding Questions", ide	ntify and define	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:			Meet the requ	Meet the requirements of the state for AMOs.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:	
59%	performing at level 3 or	above.	Meet the requ	Meet the requirements of the state for AMOs.		
	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	Falling Short of Goal.	Target Reading, Writing, Math, and Science Learning Skills for All Students.	LLT RtI Teams IL	LTMs (Learning Team Meetings) and Data- Based Discussions	Diagnostic Tools SRI FCAT EOCs	

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.

Meet AMO targets for 2013.

Scie	nce Goal #1b:					
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
ND			Meet AMO tarç	Meet AMO targets for 2013.		
	Prob	lem-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	Virtual Students are resistant to standardized testing due to various reasons.	Follow strategies of state-wide school in charge of overall curriculum and instruction.	Principal	Monitoring of Progress Reports and Data from Students Attending Testing Sessions.	Test Results	

	d on the analysis of stud in need of improvement			Guiding Questions", ider	ntify and define	
Achie	2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:			Meet AMO targets for 2013.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:	
ND	ND			Meet AMO targets for 2013.		
	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	Not maintaining current high levels of proficiency.	Enhance all content areas with higher order thinking skills through every content area.	Principal and Teachers	Parent / Teacher / Administrator Conferences based on Reports	Diagnostics FCAT SRI EOC	

	d on the analysis of stud in need of improvement			ference to "(Guiding Questions", ide	entify and define
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:				Meet AMO targets for 2013.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			20	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
ND			Me	Meet AMO targets for 2013.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achiever						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp	erson or osition onsible for onitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

	Virtual School Families	Follow strategies of	Principal and	Monitoring Progress	Diagnostics
	resist standardized	state-wide school in	Teachers	Reports of Students	FAIR
1	testing for various	charge of overall		Attending Testing	SRI
	reasons.	curriculum and		Sessions.	Other measures
		instruction.			

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)).

(35)).					
	of student achievement data vement for the following gro		l reference	to "Guiding Questions",	, identify and define
1. Florida Alternate A at Levels 4, 5, and 6 i	ssessment: Students sco n science.	ring			
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s 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		
	of student achievement data vement for the following gro		l reference	to "Guiding Questions",	, identify and define
2. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 ir	ssessment: Students sco n science.	ring			
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Process	s 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		

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 to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible Strategy Evaluation Tool Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring

No Data Submitted

	of student achievement data vement for the following gro		l reference	to "Guiding Questions	s", identify and define
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data :	Submitted		

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	No Data Submitted	d		

Science 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 Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Bas	ed on the analysis of s	tudent achievement da	ta, and r	eference to "Guidin	na Questions", identify	and define areas
	eed of improvement for				<u> </u>	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:			Meet AMO targets for 2013.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected L	evel of Performance:		
1	A total of 60% of students tested made proficiency in writing.			Meet AMO targets	for 2013.	
	ŀ	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to I	ncrease Student /	Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students need constant parent	Discuss note-taking and physical writing	Principal/Teachers/Parents		Progress Monitoring Parent Conferences	FCAT Writes Formal and

	supervision in order	with parents often		Informal
1	for them to take the	and promote writing		Assessments
'	notes they should in a	out notes rather than		
	virtual school and	studying from the		
	sometimes the	computer.		
	support is not given.			

Based on the analysis o in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	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 Proces	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 :	Submitted		

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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
Strategy No Data	Description of Resources No Data	Funding Source No Data	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Amount

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)).

ı	on the analysis of studeed of improvement for the	ent achievement data, and e following group:	d reference to "Gu	ilding Questions", identif	y and define areas	
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:			NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	d Level of Performanc	e:	
NA			NA	NA		
	Pro	blem-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	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. NA Civics Goal #2: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: NA NΑ 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 NΑ NΑ NΑ

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:				
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. History. History.	NA			
U.S. History Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA	NA			

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

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

1	d on the analysis of studeed of improvement for th	ent achievement data, an e following group:	d reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels4 and 5 in U.S. History.U.S. History Goal #2:			NA NA	NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expecte	d Level of Performanc	e:	
NA			NA	NA		
	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 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						

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)).

	d on the analysis of atte provement:	ndance data, and refere	ence to "Guiding Qu	estions", identify and de	fine areas in need		
1. At	tendance						
Attendance Goal #1:			NA				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:			2013 Expecte	ed Attendance Rate:			
NA			NA	NA			
	Current Number of Stunces (10 or more)	udents with Excessive	2013 Expecte Absences (10	ed Number of Students O or more)	s with Excessive		
NA			NA	NA			
1	Current Number of Studes (10 or more)	udents with Excessive		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
NA			NA	NA			
	Pro	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	As a virtual school, attendance is not applicable.	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						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	arri(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 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:	NA			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
NA	NA			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School			
NA	NA			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			

NA AV		NA			
·		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			
NA		NA			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

Suspension 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 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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement:	f parent involvement data, a	and ref	ference to	"Guiding Questions", ide	entify and define areas
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.		NA			
2012 Current Dropout Rate:			2013 Ехр	ected Dropout Rate:	
NA		NA			
2012 Current Graduati	on Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
NA			NA		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Nc	o Data S	Submitted		

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

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

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

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

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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

	Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Pa	rent Involvement					
*Plea	Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.			Face-to-face orientation and parent support sessions are offered to ensure that parents understand both the student and learning coach roles in virtual education.		
2012	Current Level of Parer	nt Involvement:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Parent Invo	Ivement:	
	98% of parents attended the face-to-face orientation sessions.			100% of parents will attend the face-to-face orientation sessions.		
	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 Tool	
1	Parents who do not closely monitor their children's time on academic coursework.	Modify the orientation sessions to more deeply address the day-to-day role of the learning coach/parent in the online learning environment. Follow-up with phone calls to parents whose students fall behind.		All students successfully complete their courses.	Learning Management System data fields	

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

* When using percentages, include t	ne 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 Pro	cess to L	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	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 Submitte	d		

STEM 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 STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	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
		N	lo Data Submitted	d		

CTE Budget:

			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	·		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 F	Program(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Deve	elopment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



Are you a reward school: † Yes † No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC Meetings will be held in September, November, January, March, and May. Activities are minimal and will be determined by the previous meeting.

Plans for next meeting include ongoing review of SIP and upcoming academic activities for 2012-2013 school year.

Further plans will be determined by SAC from meeting to meeting.

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