

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: ESCAMBI A CHARTER SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Jerome Chisolm

SAC Chair: Jacquelyn Smith

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/29/2012

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 | Jerome Chisolm | MPA,BS,Social Science Certification | 15 | 12 | The Principal is a retired military officer with a wealth of knowledge in multifaceted organizations. He was extremely instrumental in the school becoming SACS Accredited in 2003. He led the school through a successful SACS Review in 2008. Being such a small school with a large academic deficient population, the school averages approximately 20 graduates per year. In 2006 the school was recognized by the Governor as one of the 100 performing schools in writing. In 2010 the school received a \$5,000 literacy grant from the Dollar General Corporation. The classrooms have become interactive to stimulate students' interests. An entirely new staff with the exception of one teacher provided the school with marked improvement in student achievement. At the beginning of this year, a subject matter expert in data analysis, classroom management, and strategies for effective classroom strategies was brought in to provide professional development. As a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | result of this training, the school's Lower 30 showed learning gains of 28% in Reading and 78% in Math during the Spring 2011 FCAT. There was a significant decrease in level 1 students from the previous year in Reading. This was accomplished with a continuous revolving student population. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

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.

| | 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) |
|-------------------|------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| No data submitted | | | | | |

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 | The school in light of the fact that it may undergo a 10% cut for the coming school year got a recommendation from the board of directors to give returning instructors a 3.5% raise for the coming school year. | Principal | August 15, 2011 | |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7 | 0.0%(0) | 28.6%(2) | 42.9%(3) | 28.6%(2) | 42.9%(3) | 85.7%(6) | 14.3%(1) | 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 Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are provided the necessary assistance. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for migrant children are provided by the district level Title 1 office.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title 1 office.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional development activities (inservice education).

Title III

Services for English language learners are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who have ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement on their teaching certificate.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Social Worker to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the District Title 1 Office.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI monies were reduced and/or eliminated from our school's budget.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our Behavior Management Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue to offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria.

Housing Programs

This is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title 1 District Office.

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

Evening classes are offered at all of our high schools.

Career and Technical Education

We normally host a career day during the Spring months to expose our students to the myriad of career opportunities available to them.

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.

We are very small with only six instructional staff members, therefore; all instructional members along with the principal are members of the team. We will encompass our literary and RTI teams into our Learning Community and have one 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?

The team will meet Monday- Wednesday to discuss best practices, analysis data, identify gaps in curriculum, define strengths and weaknesses, devises strategies based on the data to improve students learning. The team also identifies those students who are not making progress and establishes conferences with students and parents to map out strategies to get students on track.

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 team along with the principal develops the goals and objectives that they wish to accomplish for the year. They review and analyze student achievement data and design a curriculum to improve the achievement levels of all levels 1 and 2 students.

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.

We will use the D.A.R.T. Model to analyze, assess, review and target the students needs with current practices. This model will allow to identify, list and prioritize strengths and weaknesses in each of the curriculum area.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Study Island can provide RTI training to the staff as a webnair.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

ECS being a small school will combine its RTI and Literacy Leadership teams to get maximum effort from the group.

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

The team meets every Monday-Wednesdays before school to determine problem areas, strength and weaknesses concerning literacy within the curriculum, how best to increase literacy across the curriculum, develop strategies to increase student learning. The Principal facilitates the meetings with input from the instructional staff. Each staff member will keep data on students progress to include formative and summative assessments. The data will be analyze to determine progress and learning gains.

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

The major initiatives the LLT will attack this year will be the reduction of the number of students at achievement level 1. Currently, we are at 64 percent achievement level 1 for 10th grade. Additionally, we want to raise the number of 10th grade students meeting proficiency. Presently, we are at 6% proficiency in reading.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

*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.

Every Monday-Wednesday all teachers meet to discuss the educational standards and assessments that can be aligned based on the category of content covered and the complexity of knowledge required. They will bring with them five words they all can use in their lessons to show students the different usage and meaning of those words. These words will be listed on all classroom word walls.

*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?

Many of our students are academically deficient when they come to us. In order to get them academically whole we must incorporate computer based instructions blended with traditional instruction to get them motivated towards graduation. These students acquire the understanding of needing to put forth their best effort because they do not have any options for failing.

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?

All of our students are encouraged to take the ACT, CPT, and ASVAB. Our 10th graders are required to take the PLAN test. They see the correlation between preparing for the future and having no plans.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

Feedback Report

The majority of our students gravitate towards the military because they had such an academic struggle in high school. Instead of college they give more consideration to joining the workforce or the military.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | Increase the students' proficiency level from 5 to 12 percent and increase students' learning gains to 48% on the Spring 2012 FCAT Test. We will use programs such as Empower 3000, FCAT EXPLORER, ACHIEVE 3000, and FCAT Testmaker to develop students reading skills. Every Friday students will be given a simulated test to determine their progress. Those students not meeting the standards will be given additional work to include homework. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Results from 2011 Spring FCAT indicated that 22 students took test, 5% (1) tested at proficiency level 3. Level 1 percentage decreased from 94% the previous year to 64% this year. Achievement level 2 increased from 6% to 32%. | We want to raise this proficiency level percentage by 7 percent and increase learning gains by 20 percent. |

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 | Historically we have always had a nomadic student population. Students enrolling in school are three to four grade levels behind. | Identify all students that are not at achievement level 3 or not passed the Reading portion of the FCAT and placed them in an intensive training with constant assessments. Students not making progress will be placed in FLEX training at a minimum of once a week for 30 minutes of rigorous remediation to address their weakness. We have invested in a spelling and vocabulary interactive website to improve their skills. Students will be assigned to the ACHIEVE 3000 Program. | Principal along with the Learning Community will monitor the progress across the curriculum. | Weekly assessments, FAIR, student progress data, and teacher generated activities. Progress reports from ACHIEVE 3000 | Weekly assessments, vocabulary and spelling tests, ACHIEVE 3000 weekly progress, FCAT simulated assessments and teacher evaluation. |
| 2 | This year we will institute the 50/50 club to try and get 50% of our students testing in Reading to proficiency. This will take a monumental effort because students and parents will have to buy into the amount of effort that need to be expended to make this happen. | We will analyze the data from the previous test results and determine all level 1 and 2 students. We will calculate what it would take to get them to proficiency. We will teach the weakest areas first and proceed as students progress improve. Our learning community will determine the assessment and track student progress. Students will be given more rigorous and challenging assignments to complete. | Professional Learning Community | Periodically each teacher will give a self generated test. Achieve 3000 has targeted benchmarks that will provide an indication as to how well a student is progressing. We have purchased a web program (Study Island) that have all the parameters for measuring students' progress. | Teacher generated test, FCAT Testmaker, and Achieve 3000. Study Island |
| 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 group:

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. | | | We have established a digital library by purchasing 20 Kindles that will provide a variety of reading materials which will assist in having students read more challenging material which should allow them to score above level 3 on the Reading FCAT. | | |
| Reading Goal #2a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| Currently, we have no students who scored at achievement levels 4, and 5. | | | We anticipate that a minimum of 3 percent of 10th grade students taking the Spring 2012 Reading FCAT will score above achievement level 3. | | |
| 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 | Provide time and challenging work to determine the depth of knowledge that these students have maintained. | These students will utilize the Kindles, Class projects,FCAT Explorer, and FCAT Test maker to develop strong reading skills to help maintain and level above proficiency. | Reading Teacher, Principal, and other staff members. | Webb's Depth Of Knowledge Model. | FCAT Test maker,Teacher generated test,Continous assessments. |
| 2 | Provided enough time is allotted students need to become proficient in each skill. | This will be an ongoing project. Students will have at their access a minimum of 10 books per, and Kindles to develop strong reading skills which will help them to score above achievement level 3 on the FCAT. | Reading teacher/Reading coach | Webb's Depth of Knowledge Model. | Teacher generated test, FCAT Test maker,weekly 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:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #2b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading by 50 percent of last year's total. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| There was a combined 61 percent difference in the percentage of students at level 1 (94) compared to results in 2011(64). In 2010 6 percent of students were at achievement level 2 in contrast to 2011 with 32 percent. Additionally, 5 percent were at proficiency in 2011 compared to none in 2010. Moreover, the 12th graders taking the Retake had a 45% (5) passing percentage, which was the highest in the District. | We expect to reverse the percentage where 50 percent of the students taking the 2011 test will exhibit learning gains as compared to 2011. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | Many of the students enrolling are on average three to four grade levels behind. This couple with family problems which translate to excessive absentees have a negative impact on learning. | In spite of the barriers we were able to make progress this year. Last year 16 students took the test and we were at 94% (15) level 1 with a 6% (1) passing rate and no students at level 3. This year there were 22 students who took the test 32% (7) passed. Achievement level 1 students was reduced to 64% (14) achievement level 2 increased from 6% (1) to 32% (7) and achievement level 3 increased to 5% (1). We will continue to maintain the programs and software we have incorporated to continually push to have all of our students at | All staff/Principal | Evidence of students weekly progress. | Achieved 3000, Class projects, FCAT Test maker, assessments, and Teacher generated activities. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------|---|--|
| | | proficiency. | | | |
| 2 | Many of our students come from low socio-economic backgrounds with numerous issues that sometimes prevent them from staying fully focus on academics. | We have web based software (Study Island) that allows students to access their work outside of the classroom. All achievement levels 1 and 2 students will be given homework to assist in their learning process. Students will be given weekly assessments. They will be given higher order thinking questions to develop their comprehension. Teachers will use vocabulary/spelling software to promote word recognition and comprehension skills. | Staff/Principal. | Evidence of student weekly progression. | FCAT test maker, teacher generated test, Achieve 3000, Study Island, and Vocabulary/Spelling software. |

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 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:

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | | | Increase by 30 percent students in the lowest 25 percent making learning gains in reading. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| There were 18 students in the lowest 30 percent, 28% (5) exhibited learning gains. | | | We anticipate that 30 percent of the lowest 25 percent in reading will make learning gains. | | |
| 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 | Our subgroups were not large enough for the lowest 25% so we had to move to lowest 30%. Students coming to school on a regular basis and demonstrating a willingness to learn are largest barrier to Reading. | There were 18 students who were in the lowest 30 students 28% (5) of these students recorded learning gains. We will monitor these students and place them in a rigorous reading program with constant assessment to track their growth. those not demonstrating progress will be given additional work and tutoring. | All staff. | Identify those students in the lowest 30 and track them weekly to determine their progress. Students not showing progress will be remediated. | Achieve 3,000, FCAT Explorer, FCAT Test maker, Spelling/Vocabulary software and Teacher generated activities. |
| 2 | Many of these students have poor attendance which negatively impacts learning gains. | These students have their parents come to school on request of principal and will enter into a learning contract that if they miss excessive days or do not show progress they will attend Saturday remediation along with their parents. They will be assessed to determine their strength and weaknesses. They will be monitored for behavioral and performance assessments to get a more realistic understanding of where these students are and how to help them. | Staff/Principal | Frequent monitoring of progress reports, daily attendance, and weekly assessments. | FCAT test maker, Achieve 3000, teacher generated test, and frequent observations. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Reading Goal # <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> 5A : <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | | | Decrease the percentage of black 10th grade students at achievement level 1 and increase the level of proficiency by 7%. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| There were 4 white students who took the 10th grade reading, 50% (2) passed, 25% (1) was at level 2, and 25% (1) at level 1. 16 black students took the test 25% (4) passed, 75% (12) were at level 1. One American Indian took the test and was at proficiency. | | | Increase the number of black students achieving level 3 by 30 percent of the total number of 10th grade students taking the test. | | |
| 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 | Socio-economics continues to be an inhibitor on student achievement. Our single parent and free and reduce population continues to grow which impacts students' absentee rates. | WE have White, Black, American Indian, and Asian decent students in our school. 4 White students took the test 50% (2) passed. 25% (1) was at achievement level 1. 16 Black students took the test 25% (4) passed, 75% (12) were at achievement level 1. 1 American Indian took the test, he was at achievement level 3. We will continue monitoring these students and those at achievement level 1 will be placed in intensive learning classes. | All Staff | These students will be tracked on a weekly basis and their progress plotted to determine the necessary interventions needed to get them proficient. | ACHIEVE 3000, Kindles, Read Aloud, FAIR, FCAT Test maker. |
| 2 | Students' confidence level and knowledge/skills previously learned. | Students will be assessed to determine their prior knowledge and what level they are performing at. Students will be given more qualitative instructions and frequent assessments to ensure they are learning what is being taught. Tutoring will be offered and parents will be invited to attend. | Teacher/Principal. | Teachers will review progress of students with principal during weekly meetings. Those strategies that appears to be ineffective will be reviewed. | Achieve 3000, FCAT test maker, Study Island, teacher generated test, and Vocabulary/Spelling software. |
| 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | As per yearly progress this is not applicable due to not enough students to satisfy the criteria for subgroups. |
| | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring at proficiency on the reading test by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 87% (85) percent of the total student population were considered economically disadvantaged. Black students made up 87% (74) of the economically disadvantaged students. | Increase the percentage of 10th grade economically disadvantaged students meeting proficiency by 25 percent of last year's total. |

| 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 | 87% (85) were free and reduced lunch. Black students comprised 87% (74) of the free and reduced roster. Student population tend to be sporadic due to the mobility of the students. | We have shown improvements in all areas. We will concentrate on data analysis to track students progress and provide intervention for those not showing progress. | All Staff | Progress of weekly assessment and Teacher generated activities. | assessments, FCAT Test maker, Study Island, and Teacher assessment. |
| 2 | Strong daily attendance. | Students who exhibit poor attendance will be matched with a mentor to reduce the absentee rate. Develop differentiated instructions to increase students' understanding of lesson content so they will be able to successfully meet the objectives. | Reading teacher/Principal. | Daily monitoring. | FCAT test maker, Daily attendance, Lesson Plans, and teacher resources. |

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 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 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 Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

CELLA 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 CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |

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

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Mathematics Goal # <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> 5A : | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> | <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | |

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5D:

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

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal E:

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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 | | | | |

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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 |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

Mathematics 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 Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | |
| Science Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Science Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1: | | | Increase students' knowledge in Science content areas where at least 40 percent of them taking the Science test will meet proficiency. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| There were 12 students who took the Science FCAT and none of them met proficiency. Eighty-three percent (10) were at achievement level 1. Seventeen percent (2) were at achievement level 2. | | | Decrease the number of achievement level 1's by 50 percent (5) while raising the number attaining achievement level 3 by 40 percent (5). | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The majority of the students taking the Science FCAT had no previous science classes and are deficient in Reading and Math which makes it difficult for them to perform adequately in science. | We will develop questions that will elicit responses that will demonstrate students complexity of knowledge and skills required to meet the objectives. Teachers will meet weekly to discuss and develop benchmarks and standards that will strengthen students' depth of knowledge to improve their achievement levels. | Science Teacher/Principal | Webb's Depth of Knowledge Model | Assessments, Teacher Generated test, FCAT Test maker. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement | |
|---|--|

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. | | | | |
| Biology Goal #2: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

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

Science 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 |

Writing Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | Increase the writing proficiency of 10th grade students by 30 percent of last year's total (50) on the Spring 2011 FCAT writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Thirty-two students took the Spring 2012 writing test 50 percent (16) scored at proficiency level 3.0 and above. 6% (2) were at achievement level 4 and none at achievement level 5. Our 36% proficiency decrease over the 2011 results are a direct correlation to the higher standards implemented for this year's testing. | For the Spring 2013 FCAT writing test the goal is to have 95 percent of students taking the test score at 3.0 or above. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students focus to accomplish the task. The implementation of the higher writing standards to previously low performing students. | The students will be assigned a variety of writing activities to get them comfortable with the skills needed to become a proficient writer. They will also use the writing activities in Study Island, Achieve 3000, and Vocabulary/Spelling websites a minimum of two times per week to increase their writing skills. They will be introduced to a myriad of vocabulary words to increase their comprehension. Students will be assessed weekly. Additionally, they will be introduced to e-global library to expand their higher order thinking. | All Staff/Principal | Webb's Depth of Knowledge Model, Work product, weekly progression. | Study Island, FCAT Test maker, Teacher generated test, and vocabulary/spelling website. |

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

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

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

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/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

| | | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1: | | 50% of students enrolled in U.S. History will achieve level 3 on their EOC. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| We were not an implementation school for this year. No data was comprised. | | 50% of students enrolled in U.S. History will pass their EOC. | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Attendance | | | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1: | | Increase students attendance rate to 90 percent for the coming school year. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| Current attendance rate for 2012 was 84 percent (107). | | Expected attendance rate for 2013 is 90 percent. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| Seventy-seven students had 10 or more absences during the 2012 school year. | | We expect to reduce the number of excessive absences for the coming year by 50 percent. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| Eighteen students had 10 or more tardies during last year. | | We want to reduce the excessive tardies by 50 percent for the coming year. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Parents actively ensuring that their child | We have purchased an automated message | Administrative Assistance and | The daily percentage of students present | The daily attendance |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | come to school on a regular basis. Students not wanting to come to school on a daily basis. | calling system that will allow us to send directed messages alerting parents of chronic absentees. We will offer incentives in the form of gift cards per semester for students with highest attendance rate at 90 percent and above. We will set a ceiling on the number of days a student will be allowed to miss. When a student is in jeopardy of hitting this ceiling, a meeting will be established with student and parents to have student put in writing why they should remain at ECS and acknowledgement of consequences if action continues. | Principal. | compared to students who are absent. | report. |
| 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Suspension | | | | | |
| Suspension Goal # 1: | | | Reduce the number of out of school suspensions by half through the implementation of a positive behavior plan. | | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | | | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | |
| There were 130 in-school suspensions recorded this year (our in school suspension is after school detail). | | | We expect to reduce the in-school suspensions to 70 for this school year. | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | |
| 70 students were given in-school suspensions for the year. | | | We expect to reduce the number of students serving in-school-suspensions to 30 for the coming year. | | |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| There were 78 out-of-school suspensions for the year. | | | The implementation of a positive behavior plan will reduce the out-of-school suspensions by 75 percent. | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | |
| There were 41 total students suspended out-of-school this past year. | | | We expect less than 50 students to serve out-of-school suspensions for the coming year. | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Majority of students enrolling in school have behavioral issues, or general apathy to school rules and procedures. | Prior to school we will have the positive behavior team categorize possible violations into low, medium, and high risk. Low risk offenses will be handled by teacher and a telephone call home. Medium risk will be removed from classroom to the Dean for redirection and telephone call home. High risk will result in immediate removal from classroom, parent | Teachers,Dean, and Principal. | The positive behavior team will review the incidents and actions taken to determine if the strategies are effective. | Observation. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | conference, and suspension if no other outcome can be reached. Students will be given after school detail prior to suspensions, if it does not involve an incident of safety or good order to the school. | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Dropout Prevention | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | Students enrolling in Escambia Charter normally are academically behind their cohorts, or have other socio-economic issues that need to be addressed. |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: |
| The current dropout rate is 11.2 for the 2012 school year. | The expected dropout rate for 2013 is anticipated to be 5 percent. |
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |
| The school caters to at risk students therefore, graduation rate will always be an issue as the majority of our graduates do so, after their cohorts. This past year we had 17 candidates for graduation. 65% (11) received diplomas, 24% (4) received certificate of completions and 18% (3) are finishing their remaining requirements. | Expected graduation rate is anticipated to be 80 percent with Diplomas (19). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------|
| 1 | The majority of students enrolling at Escambia Charter are already credit deficient, been retained, and associate with someone who has dropped out of school. Retention by grade is high with the following numbers being retained at these grade levels: 27 - 9th graders; 16 - 10th graders; 6 - 11th graders; and 10 - 12th graders. | We provide transportation for our students to attend evening classes at Pensacola State College to make up some of their credit deficiencies, some students are encouraged to enroll in virtual school, and recently we have the capability of providing them with credit recovery. There is also after school tutoring for those students who are interested in improving their academic success. There is a mentoring group for the female students. We are in the process of providing the same for the male students. We are providing a variety of opportunities for our students to receive additional assistance to support their learning beyond the classroom instruction. | Staff/Principal. | Frequent observation of students' progress reports and attendance. | Progress reports. |

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | Increase parental involvement by 40 percent by helping parents to monitor their child's progress and improve their achievement. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| There was a significant increase in parent involvement (30%) than the previous years. Parents came out and supported the school both athletically and gave community service support. | For the coming year we anticipate that parental involvement will increase to 75 percent of available parents. We will provide parents with sign-up letters requesting them to support the parental involvement initiative. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |
| | Person or Process Used to |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Many of our parents are from working single parent households, or they do not have adequate transportation. | To ensure parents become more active in their child's progress, we will not mailout report cards but will hand them out at the quarterly parent/teacher meetings. Each parent has a code which allows them to monitor their child's weekly progress and consult with the teachers electronically. We also have mass communication capabilities to get urgent messages out to parents concerning the school. Parents have been invited to volunteer at the school in a myriad of capacities. | Staff/Principal | Surveys, interviews, and participation. | Sign-in sheets, feedback, and documentation. |

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:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. STEM | | | | | |
| STEM Goal #1: | | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

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 | | | N/A | | |
| CTE Goal #1: | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

☒ Priority

☒ Focus

☒ Prevent

☒ NA

Are you a reward school: ☒ Yes ☒ No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☒ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

This year's SAC will explore fundraising and partnership opportunities for the school. At our first meeting there was a lengthy discussion on fundraising and community service projects the school could readily get involved with.

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