FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ADULT EDUCATION CENTER OF PALM BEACH

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Mr. Rickey Gene Swearingen

SAC Chair: Ms. Silvia Giovanardi

Superintendent: Mr. E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 11/5/2012



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)
Assis Principal	Elizabeth W. Fields	BS, Southern University, MS, Nova Southeastern University Certification: Education Leadership, Social Science, Middle Grades Endorsement	4	8	2006-2009 Assistant Principal at JFK Middle School: 2007—D 2008—D 2009—C 2010-onwards: Adult Education Center, Assistant Principal 2010 - In FY10, 66.6% of Adult ESOL students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) and the GED pass rate was 67% (98 studets passed, out of 147) 2011 - In FY11, 64% of Adult ESOL students and 69% of ABE/GED students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP). In FY12, 25.77% of Adult ABE/GED and ESOL students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP), a total of 1720 LCPs were recorded in the TABE and

					CASAS tests, respectively.
Assis Principal	Nancy D. Tidwell	BA, Florida State University; M.S., Kansas State University Certification: English 6-12; Social Science 6- 12; Journalism 6-12; Reading and ESOL Endorsement; School Principal All Levels	4	16	2002-2009 Administrator at South Tech Academy, a conversion charter high school (Boynton Beach): 2007—D 2008—D 2009—D 2010-onwards: Adult Education Center, Assistant Principal In FY10 66.6% of Adult ESOL students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP), and the GED pass rate was 67% (98 students passed, out of 147) In FY11, 64% of Adult ESOL students and 69% of ABE/GED students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP). In FY12, 25.77% of Adult ABE/GED and ESOL students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (ILCP), a total of 1720 LCPs were recorded in the TABE and CASAS tests, respectively.
Principal	Mr. Rick Swearingen	B.A. Eastern Kentucky University; M.S. Nova Southeastern University Certification: General Science 5-9; School Principal All Levels	2	18	2007-2011 Atlantic Community High School (Delray Beach. Assistant Principal for Adult & Community Education 2007-C 2008-C 2009-B 2010-B 2011-A 2011-onwards: Adult Education Center, Principal. In FY12, 25.77% of Adult ABE/GED and ESOL students earned at least one Literacy Completion Points (LCPs), a total of 1720 LCPs were recorded in the TABE and CASAS tests, respectively.

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)

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	Peoplesoft application/resumes Marzano monitoring Professional Development Local media advertisements as needed Continue recruitment of retired teachers for part-time staff	Administration	1,2,3 Ongoing 4, 5 As needed	

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

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		% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
17	0.0%(0)	11.8%(2)	17.6%(3)	70.6%(12)	41.2%(7)	0.0%(0)	11.8%(2)	0.0%(0)	47.1%(8)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

programs, nousing programs, Head S	tart, adult education, career and t	recnnical education, and/or job	training, as applicable.
Title I, Part A			
Title I, Part C- Migrant			
Title I, Part D			
Title II			
Title III			

District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity. Utilition Programs ousing Programs ead Start dutil Education areer and Technical Education areer and Technical Education bib Training ther fullti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rtl) School-based MTSS/Rtl Team dentity the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Perscribe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Bescribe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cleanse, writing, and behavior.	itle X- Homeless
District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity. utrition Programs ousing Programs ousing Programs and Education areer and Technical Education areer and Technical Education areer and Technical Education areer and Technical Education bib Training lither lither lither lither lither and Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RtI Team dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. dentify 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? Approximately 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? Approximately the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement land. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation MTSS Implementation mescribe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
ousing Programs ousing Programs out Start dult Education areer and Technical Education by Training ther fullti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rtl) School-based MTSS/RIL Team dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. dentify 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? describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SiP? MTSS Implementation— describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	iolence Prevention Programs
ead Start dult Education areer and Technical Education by Training ther choice System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rtl) School-based MTSS/RIL Team dentity the school-based MTSS leadership team. Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lam. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, clence, writing, and behavior.	District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.
ead Start dult Education arear and Technical Education ther lutti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RII Team dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. dentify 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation MTSS Implementation describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, clence, writing, and behavior.	lutrition Programs
dult Education areer and Technical Education ab Training ther ther lutti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RtI Team— dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation— Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, clence, writing, and behavior.	lousing Programs
areer and Technical Education bb Training ther fulti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RtI Team— dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team. bescribe 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? bescribe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation— bescribe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	lead Start
ther fulti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RtI Team dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	dult Education
ther fullti-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) School-based MTSS/RtI Team dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	areer and Technical Education
dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation— Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	ob Training
dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	Other Control of the
dentify the school-based MTSS leadership 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? Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement lan. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement clan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, clence, writing, and behavior.	dentify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
MTSS Implementation Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	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?
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement blan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, cience, writing, and behavior.	
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.	MTSS I mplementation 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.
	Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

escribe the plan to support MTSS.
teracy Leadership Team (LLT)
School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
lentify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
entity the school-based energy readership ream (EET).
escribe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
hat will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
ublic School Choice
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment
Ilementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
escribe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs a plicable.
Grades 6-12 Only
ec. 1003.413(b) F.S.
r schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher
ligh Schools Only
ote: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
ow does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and levance to their future?
ow does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that udents' course of study is personally meaningful?
ostsecondary Transition ote: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

 $Describe \ strategies \ for \ improving \ student \ readiness \ for \ the \ public \ postsecondary \ level \ based \ on \ annual \ analysis \ of \ the \ \underline{High \ School}$

eedback Report			

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 During the FY13 at least 32.2% of eligible students will earn reading. at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) as measured by the CASAS test for ESOL students and the TABE test for the Reading Goal #1a: ABE/GED students. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: ESOL: By June 2012, 25.77% of eligible students earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP), as measured by 32.2% of eligible studets will earn at least one Literacy the CASAS test for ESOL students, and the TABE test for the Completion Point (LCP). ABE/GED students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Pr	oblem-Solving Process t	o Increase Studer	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	AEC students are adults with adult situations— jobs, children/childcare, health, personal financial, legal, transportation, and family concerns—any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level.	Doc cameras LCD projectors with smart tecnology for	ESOL Teachers ABE/GED Teachers and Administration	development. Administration provides reflective feedback based on classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan review. Administration monitors that each full-time teacher submits an Individual Professional	respectively). Adequate progress is met if 32.2% of ESOL students taking the CASAS test earn at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP). ABE/GED Adequate progress is met if 32.2% of ABE/GED students

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

			No Data	Submitted			
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		Problem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
2012	Current Level of Pe	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level	4 in reading. ng Goal #2a:	2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2					
of imp	rovement for the fol			1	uiding Questions", identi	ify and define areas in need	
		<u> </u>		Submitted			
Antic	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsition for		Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		Problem-Solving Prod	cess to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement		
2012	Current Level of Po	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	ng Goal #1b:						
	orida Alternate As nts scoring at Lev	sessment: els 4, 5, and 6 in reading					
	on the analysis of s		and refer	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identi	ify and define areas in need	
2							
2		instruction					
		Daily practice of ABE content-specific skil Weekly practice of ABE/GED prescribed in the ABE/GED labs. Large and small grou	ls. skills				

scheduled ESOL

computer labs.

enrichment through ESOL

of improvement for the fo	ollowing group:					
2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or reading.		Level 7 in				
Reading Goal #2b:						
2012 Current Level of F		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:		
	Problem-Solvin	g Process 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	
			Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentag		ng learning				
Reading Goal #3a:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:	
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion consible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
3b. Florida Alternate A Percentage of students reading.		ains in				
Reading Goal #3b:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:	
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		

Anticipated E	Barrier Strategy Position For		for	Process lised to		Evaluation Tool			
			No	Data S	Submitted				
Based on the a			ent data, and	d refer	ence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and d	efine areas in need
-	Percentage	e of students in L	owest 25%	,					
Reading Goal	#4:								
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		for		Process U Determin Effective Strategy	ie	Evalu	uation Tool
		1	No		Submitted				
Based on Amb	itious but A	achievable Annual			ves (AMOs	s), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Per	formance Target
	jectives (A	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	Reading Goa	11 #					<u></u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	201	4-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
		student achievem llowing subgroup:		d refer	ence to "G	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and d	efine areas in need
Hispanic, Asia satisfactory p	an, Americ progress ir	by ethnicity (Whan Indian) not nareading.							
Reading Goal	#5B:								
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Du III - 5 -	lada a B						
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to li	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement		

Anticipated Barrier	pated Barrier Strategy Posi Res for		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		lata, and refer	ence to "G	fulding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in nee	
5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i		aking				
Reading Goal #5C:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:	
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		lata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disal satisfactory progress in		king				
Reading Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	nance:	
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E:

for Strategy	2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Position Evaluation Tool							
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Strategy Evaluation Tool		Problem-Solvir	ng Process to Ir	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
3	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Effectiveness of Evaluation Tool						

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
Electronic testing; Technology in the classroom; Reseach work; New Language Arts and Literature books and material; Testing data analysis; Lesson Planning; Special presentations.	All ABE/GED, and ESOL levels	Department Chairs, Administration, PD Teams Special Guests	All ESOL and ABE/GED Teachers	Monthly or as necessary		Administration and Department Chairs

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

					Ena or Re
Comprehensive Er	nglish Language	Learning Asses	ssme	nt (CELLA) Goa	ls
* When using percentages	s, include the number o	of students the percen	tage re	epresents next to the pe	ercentage (e.g., 70% (35))
Students speak in Engli	sh and understand sp	ooken English at grad	de leve	el in a manner similar	to non-ELL students.
1. Students scoring p	roficient in listening	g/speaking.			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent	of Students Profici	ent in listening/sp	eakin	g:	
	Problem-Solving	Process to Increa	se Stı	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsib for Monitoring	le E	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Submit	ted		
Students read in English	h at grade level text	in a manner similar t	o non	-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring p	roficient in reading				
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent	of Students Profici	ent in reading:			
	Problem-Solving	Process to Increa	se Stu	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsib for Monitoring	le E	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Submit	ted		

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.							
3. Students scoring pr	oficient in writing.						
CELLA Goal #3:	CELLA Goal #3:						
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient	in writing:					
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to Increase S	Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy							
	No Data Submitted						

CELLA Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
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: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

	d on the analysis of provement for the f		chievement data, and oup:	reter	ence to "Gu	liaing	Questions", identify	and d	define areas in need
math	1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:				N/A (There currently exists no reliable data base for the AEC to track which enrolled students take the Mathematics portion of the GEDthey are not obligated to tell their teachers, and the results from the State of Florida are confidential.)				
2012	2 Current Level of I	Performan	ice:		2013 Expe	ected	Level of Performa	nce:	
GED	test (Reading, Math	ematics, S	took the comprehens cience, Social Studies shing a 67% pass rati	S,;	to track wh portion of t	nich e the Gl and th	ently exists no reliab enrolled students tak EDthey are not obl ne results from the S	e the ligate	Mathematics d to tell their
		Probl	em-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement		
	Anticipated Ba	rrier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitoring	for	Process Used t Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1									
2									
Stud Math	Florida Alternate A ents scoring at Le nematics Goal #1b Current Level of I	vels 4, 5, a	and 6 in mathemation				Level of Performan	nce:	
		1						1	
Anti	cipated Barrier	Strategy	/ /	for		Dete Effe	ess Used to ermine ctiveness of tegy	Eval	uation Tool
			No I	Data S	Submitted				
	d on the analysis of provement for the fo		hievement data, and oup:	refer	ence to "Gu	iiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in need
	CAT 2.0: Students I 4 in mathematic	_	t or above Achiever	ment					
Math	nematics Goal #2a	: 							
2012	2 Current Level of I	Performan	ice:		2013 Expe	ected	Level of Performa	nce:	

	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo		ata, and refer	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need
2b. Florida Alternate As Students scoring at or a mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	above Achievement L	₋evel 7 in			
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of sof improvement for the fo		lata, and refer	rence to "Gu	uiding Questions", iden	itify and define areas in need
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentag gains in mathematics.	je of students makino	g learning			
Mathematics Goal #3a:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		

of improvemer	nt for the fol	lowing group:							
3b. Florida Al Percentage o mathematics	fstudents	sessment: making Learning	g Gains in						
Mathematics	Goal #3b:								
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:		:	2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	s to In	icrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Person Position Responsition for Monitor	on onsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	uation Tool
			No		ubmitted	•			
Based on the a			ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in need
		of students in L n mathematics.	owest 25%						
Mathematics		Triatricinatios.							
0010 0					0010 5		L of Davidson		
2012 Current	Level of Pe	errormance:		•	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	s to In	icrease St	udent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Person Position Responsion for Monito	on onsible	Process U Determin Effective Strategy	е	Eval	uation Tool
			No	Data S	ubmitted				
Based on Amb	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable (Objectiv	ves (AMOs)), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	th Pe	rformance Target
5A. Ambitious	but Askisus	blo Approd	Middle Scho	ol Math	nematics G	oal #			
Measurable Ob	ojectives (AM	MOs). In six year hievement gap							<u></u>
Baseline data		_	5A :						▼
2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	l-2015	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 fo	llowing subgroup:				
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress in	_				
Mathematics Goal #5B:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	cudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5C. English Language Le satisfactory progress in	earners (ELL) not making n mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5C:					
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease St	rudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	o Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo	student achievement data, an llowing subgroup:	d refer	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
5D. Students with Disab satisfactory progress in	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	Strategy	Responsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
No Data Submitted									

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and Ilowing subgroup:	refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performan	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier		for .		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

improve on the

TABE post-test

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Doc cameras.

LCD projectors with

health, personal,

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at During the FY13 at least 32.2% of eligible ABE/GED Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. students will arn at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) as measured by he TABE test. Mathematics Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: By June 2012, 25.77% of eligible ABE/GED students 32.2% of eligible students will earn at least one Literacy earned at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) as Completion Point (LCP). measured by the TABE test 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 Adult Education Center Technology in the ABE/GED Per Marzano monitoring Adequate of instruction by (AEC) students are classroom and Teachers progress is met if adults with adult computer-aided and Administration: 32.2% of ABE/GED students situations: jobs, instructon. Administration monitoring incudes children/childcare,

classroom

walkthroughs, lesson

transportation and family concerns - any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level. transportation and interact Audio 6 iPads iPads Develo on mat Daily p ABE/GE specific practice prescril ABE/GE	professional development development focusing thematics. practice of ED content-ce skills. Weekly e of ABE/GED bed skills in the ED labs. Large hall group professional development devel	on provides edback ssroom s and eviews. In monitors II-time mits an ofessional E Plan on provides In regular
---	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Evaluation Tool Responsible Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Mathematics Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

Based on Amb	itious but A	Achievable Annual I	Measurable Obi	ectives (A	MOs). AMO-2.	Reading and Mat	th Performance Target
Basea err min					VIO3), 711VIO 2,		
	jectives (A		Mathematics G 5A :	oai #			<u></u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	12 2012-2013	2013-2014	1	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	9	student achieveme	ent data, and re	eference to	"Guiding Ques	stions", identify a	and define areas in need
Hispanic, Asia	an, Americ	by ethnicity (Wh can Indian) not m n mathematics.					
Mathematics	Goal #5B:	:					
2012 Current	Level of F	Performance:		2013	Expected Lev	el of Performan	nce:
		Problem-Solv	ving Process t	o Increas	e Student Ach	nievement	
Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy	Po Re fo	erson or osition esponsible r onitoring	Process I Determir Effective Strategy	ness of	Evaluation Tool
			No Da	ıta Submitt	ed		
	9	student achieveme	ent data, and re	eference to	"Guiding Ques	stions", identify a	and define areas in need
_		earners (ELL) not n mathematics.	t making				

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Problem-Solvin	ig Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "C	Guiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need	
5D. Students with Disak satisfactory progress in		aking				
Mathematics Goal #5D:						
Wathernaties Goal # 3D.						
2012 Current Level of F	erformance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:	
	Problem-Solvin	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
			Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	ence to "C	Guiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in need	
E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress in		ot making				
Mathematics Goal E:	i mathematics.					
Matriematics cour E.						
2012 Current Level of F	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvin	ig Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Res for		Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		•	Submitted			

				represents (e.g., 70% (3	identify and define area
n need of improvement			reference t	o Guiding Questions ,	identify and define area
I. Students scoring a Algebra.	t Achievement Leve	l 3 in			
Algebra Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to	Increase S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	son or ition ponsible iitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		'	Submitted		
Based on the analysis on need of improvement			reference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define are
2. Students scoring a and 5 in Algebra.	t or above Achiever	nent Levels			
Algebra Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	F Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	rmance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to	Increase S	Student Achievement	
		Pos	son or ition	Process Used to Determine	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for	ponsible	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted	,	'
					End of Algebra EOC G
eometry End-of-	Course (FOC) Go	nals			
			percentage	represents (e.g., 70% (3	25)).
Based on the analysis on need of improvement			reference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define are
I. Students scoring a Geometry.		-			
Geometry Goal #1:					

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to In				tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.		vels				
Geometry Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforn	nance:	
	Problem-Solving Process	s to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted						

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Electronic Testing; Technology in the classroom; Research work; Testing data analysis; Lesson Planning; Special	All ABE/GED levels	Department Chairs Administration PD Teams Special Guests	ABE/GED Teachers	Monthly or as necessary	Self-reflection and feedback from teachers as reported to Administration. Analysis of ABE/GED assessment data	Administration and Department Chairs

Presentations	1					l I
E20/20	ABE/GED	School District	ABE/GED Teachers	According to School District schedule	Self-reflection and feedback from teachers as reported to Administration. Analysis of ABE/GED assessment data	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program	ı(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 Developmen	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	-		Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

	d on the analysis of stud in need of improvement			"Guiding Questions", ider	ntify and define	
Leve	CAT2.0: Students scor I 3 in science. nce Goal #1a:	ing at Achievement	AEC to track portion of the	N/A (There currently exists no reliable data base for the AEC to track which enrolled students take the Science portion of the GEDthey are not obligated to tell their teachers, and the results from the State of Florida are confidential.)		
2012	Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expect	ed Level of Performand	ce:	
comp Scien	10, an estimated 147 st rehensive GED test (Rea ce, Social Studies,; and lishing a 67% pass rate	ading, Mathematics,	AEC to track portion of the	urrently exists no reliable which enrolled students GEDthey are not oblig the results from the Sta	take the Science pated to tell their	
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stud	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1						
2						
3	Adult Education Center (AEC) students are adults with adult situations: jobs, children/childcare, health, personal, financial, legal, transportation and family concerns - any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level.	classroom and computer-aided instructon. Doc cameras. LCD projectors with smart technology for interactive learning. Audio enhancement iPads Professional Development focusing on science.	ABE/GED Teachers and Administration	Per Marzano monitoring of instruction by Administration: monitoring incudes classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review, and support of collegial planning and professional development. Administration provides reflective feedback based on classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews. Administation monitors that each full-time teacher submits an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Administration provides teachers with regular opportunities (LTMs) to self-reflect on planning and its impact on improving instruction and student performance.	progress is met if 32.2% of ABE/GED students improve on the TABE post-test	

1b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at L	Assessment: Levels 4, 5, and 6 in scien	ice.				
Science Goal #1b:						
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievement		
		Pers	son or	Process Used to		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Resp for	oonsible	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	_	Submitted			
	of student achievement dat vement for the following gro		l reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Studen Achievement Level 4	ts scoring at or above in science.					
Science Goal #2a:						
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:	
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss 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		Submitted		I	
	of student achievement dat		l reference	to "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define	
2b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at o in science.	Assessment: or above Achievement Le	vel 7				
Science Goal #2b:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvina Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

(35)).						
	d on the analysis of stud s in need of improvemen			Guiding Questions", ider	ntify and define	
at Le	orida Alternate Assess evels 4, 5, and 6 in scie nce Goal #1:		During the FY1 students will e	During the FY13 at lest 32.2% of eligible ABE/GED students will earn at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) as measured by the TABE test.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performand	ce:	
earn	une 2012, 25.77% of elig ed at least one Literacy sured by the TABE test.		as 32.2% of eligi Completion Po	ble students will earn at int (LCP).	least n Literacy	
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Adult Education Center (AEC) students are adults with adult situations: jobs, children/childcare, health, personal, financial, legal, transportation and family concerns - any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level.	classroom and computer-aided instructon. Doc cameras. LCD projectors with smart technology for interactive learning. Audio enhancement iPads Professional Development focusing on science.	ABE/GED Teachers and Administration	Per Marzano monitoring of instruction by Administration: monitoring incudes classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review, and support of collegial planning and professional development. Administration provides reflective feedback based on classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews. Administration monitors that each full-time teacher submits an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Administration provides teachers with regular opportunities (LTMs) to self-reflect on planning and its impact on improving instruction and student	progress is met if 32.2% of ABE/GED students improve on the TABE post-test	

performance.

	Based 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. Florida Alternate A at or above Level 7 i	lents scoring						
Science Goal #2:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving	g Process 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				

Biology 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 a Biology.	t Achievement Level 3 in				
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

^{*} 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		
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
Electronic testing; Technology in the classroom; Research work; Testing data analysis Lesson Planning; Special Presentations	All ABE/ED levels	Department Chairs; Administration; PD Teams Special Guests	ABE/GED Teachers	Monthly or as necessary	Self-reflection and feedback from teacher, as reported to Administration; Analysis of ABE/GED assessment data.	Administration and Department Chairs

Science 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

Writing Goals

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

vviie	n using percentages, includ	ie the number of students t	ne percentage repre	senis (e.g., 70% (35)).		
	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the		nd reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas	
3.0 a	CAT 2.0: Students scor nd higher in writing. ng Goal #1a:	ing at Achievement Le	During the FY1 students will e	During the FY13 at least 32.2% of eligible ABE/GED students will earn at least one Literacy Completion Point (LCP) as measured by the TABE test.		
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performance	e:	
earne	ne 2012, 25.77% of eligil d at least one Literacy C ured by the TABE test.		32.2% of eligb Completion Poi	ole studets will earn at lea int (LCP).	ast one Literacy	
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1						
2						
3	AEC students are adults with adult situations— jobs, children/childcare, health, personal financial, legal, transportation, and family concerns—any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level	classroom and computer-aided instruction. Doc cameras. LCD projectors with smart technology for interactive learning. Audio enhancement	ABE/GED Teachers and Administration	Per Marzano monitoring of instruction by Administration: monitoring includes classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review, and support of collegial planning and professional development. Administration provides reflective feedback based on classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan review. Administration monitors that each full-time teacher submits an Individual Profesional Development Plan (IPDP). Administration provides teachers with regular opportunities (LTMs) to self-reflect on planning and its impact on improving instruction and student performance.	ABE/GED Adequate progress is met if 32.2% of ABE/GED students improve on their TABE post-test.	

in need of improvement for the following group:					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Ir	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
Electronic Testing; Technology in the Classroom; Research Work; Testing data analysis; Lesson Planning; Special Presentations	All ABE/GED and ESOL levels	Departmeht Chairs; Administration PD Teams Special Guests	ABE/GED and ESOL Teachers	Monthly or as necessary	Self-reflection and feedback from teachers as reported to Administration; Analysis of ESOL and ABE/GED asessment data.	Administration and Department Chairs

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Cour	se (EUC) Goals				
* When using percentages	, include the number of studen	ts the	percentage	represents (e.g., 70%	(35)).
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions"	', identify and define areas
1. Students scoring at	: Achievement Level 3 in C	Civics.			
Civics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perf	ormance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data	Submitted		
<u> </u>					
Based on the analysis o in need of improvement	f student achievement data, for the following group:	and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions"	', identify and define areas
2. Students scoring at 4 and 5 in Civics.	or above Achievement Le	evels			
Civics Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perf	ormance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	tor	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							

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	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 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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Strategy Responsible Anticipated Barrier Evaluation Tool Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring 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							

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 of improvement:	f attendance data, and refer	rence	to "Guiding	g Questions", identify and	d define areas in need		
1. Attendance							
Attendance Goal #1:							
2012 Current Attendance Rate:			2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Pers Posi Resp for Moni		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

Nο	Data	Subr	nitte	h

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	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 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:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School			2013 Exp School	ected Number of Stud	lents Suspended In-	
2012 Number of Out-o	f-School Suspensions		2013 Exp Suspensi	ected Number of Out- ons	of-School	
2012 Total Number of School	Students Suspended Out-	of-	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	nticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for		on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No Data Submitted					

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional 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 referen in need of improvement:				"Guiding Questions", id	lentify and define areas
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Go	pal #1:				
*Please refer to the per	centage of students who				
dropped out during the .	2011-2012 school year.				
2012 Current Dropout	Rate:		2013 Exp	ected Dropout Rate:	
2012 Current Graduati	on Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Pos Barrier Strategy Res 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	
No Data Submitted							

Dropout Prevention 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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: 1. Parent Involvement AEC students are adults with adult situations—jobs, Parent Involvement Goal #1: children/childcare, health, personal financial, legal, transportation, and family concerns—any of which may *Please refer to the percentage of parents who impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to participated in school activities, duplicated or complete programs and move to the next level unduplicated. 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: A voluntary student survey conducted in February 2012 provided a snap-shot baseline data of AEC students with A voluntary student survey to determine the number of school-age children. The survey showed 370 of the 1250 AEC students with children in Palm Beach County Schools AEC stuents surveyed at that time had 650 children who will be conducted during the 2013 school year. attended Palm Beach County District Schools. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	AEC students are adults with adult situations—jobs, children/childcare, health, personal financial, legal, transportation, and family concerns—any of which may impede instruction and the ability to attend classes regularly and, therefore, hamper the students' ability to complete programs and move to the next level	continue to reflect Florida Adult ESOL Standards associated with parenting including parental legal responsibilities relating to schooling, parent/teacher communication, accessing educational opportunities and requesting services for	ESOL and ABE/GED Teachers and Administration	development; Reflective feedback based on classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan review; Administration will provide teachers with regular opportunities (LTMs) to self-reflect on planning and its impact on improving instruction and student performance	The number of LCPs earned by ESOL students' completion of one or more Student Performance Levels on the CASAS reported in December, April and July (1st, 2nd, and 3rd

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. CTE						
CTE Goal #1:						
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Positic Respo for Monito	on nsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted						

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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 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.

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Hold four meetings: September 11, 2012 - November 13, 2012 - January 15, 2013 - March 12, 2013 Carry out a survey to determine different characteristics of the student body.

Carry out a survey to determine what additional courses and workshops would be of interest to the AEC students.

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