# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Gadsden

Principal: Dr.Kimball Thomas

SAC Chair: Mrs. Angela Burgess

Superintendent: Mr. Reginald James

Date of School Board Approval: October 23, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

# 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 | Dr.Kimball Thomas | B.S. Elementary Ed M.S. Administration/Supervision PhD Educational Leadership | 2 | 12 | 1993-1997 Kept James S. Rickards High School off FLDOE's 'Critically Low' list during tenure. 2011-2012 East Gadsden High School:Removed school from the F school list by improving the following: % Meeting High Standards in Reading from 18% to 31% % Making Learning gains in Reading from 32% to 48% % of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading from 40% to 59% Percent of students proficient in writing from 67% to 80% |
| Assis Principal | Rebecca Gaines | B.S. Criminal Justice MS Elementary Ed. MS Educational Leadership | 3 | 3 | Ms. Gaines serves as thew school's assistant principal for curriculum and on the school's RtI Leadership Team. She provides critical student success data to the Team and has been responsible for implementing the school's Master Schedule. Ms. Gaines also oversees school-wide testing. |
| | | | | | Mr. Gay has been employed by the GCSD |

| | | | | | for 21 years, as a classroom teacher,Head Football Coach, Athletic Director, and an Assistant Principal for Discipline. During the subsequent school years of 2010-2012,EGHS has seen a 20% reduction in out-of-school suspensions and zero-tolerance incidents. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Andy Gay | BS Education MS Educational Leadership | 9 | 10 | |
| Assis Principal | Maurice Stokes | BS Psychology/Education MS Educational Leadership | 1 | 3 | Mr. Stokes has worked as a teacher, GEAR-UP Coordinator, Dean of Students and an Assistant Principal. He has played a major role in reducing out-of-school suspensions and zero-tolerance incidents at EGHS during the 201102012 school year. He currently leads the EGHS Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiative at the school. |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | Myra Grant | | 2 | 5 | |
| Science | Melvin Flores | Administration | 4 | 1 | Mr. Flores is serving in his first year as Science Coach after serving as a very successful science teacher for several years at EGHS. He 's an outstanding planner and organizer. |
| Mathematics | Rhonda Cunningham | M.Ed. in Mathematics Education B.S. in Math and Computer Science National Board Certified | 15 | 2 | 2009-2010- 100% of my students scored levels 3,4,5 for 10th and 11th graders. above 50% of students in Proficiency in mathematics in math population. 2010-2011-100% of my students scored levels 3,4,5 in FCAT Math for 10th, 11th graders. 2011-2012 Met learning goals for SIP goal set for Algebra I. Provided support so that school grade moved from "F" |

## 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 | Job announcements preferring 'highly qualified' candidates Student Performance data Targeted-Selection Interviews CV or Resumes review for certification, experiences, job performance, and specific skills set | Principal Principal Principal, assistant principals, Instructional Coaches and pertinent staff | 08/19/2011 08/19/2011 08/19/2011 | |
| 2 | All Staff are Highly Qualified under NCLB/FLDOE guidelines. | | | |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56 | 16.1%(9) | 19.6%(11) | 30.4%(17) | 30.4%(17) | 12.5%(7) | 100.0%(56) | 14.3%(8) | 1.8%(1) | 12.5%(7) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lynn Clark | Gabriel Johnson | Subject Area | Modeling |
| Delma Campbell | LaTanja Peoples | Subject Area | Modeling |
| Jeremy Lynch | Diane Frost-Walker | Subject Area | Modeling |
| John Lubbers | Terrance Milton | Subject Area | Modeling |
| Shirlean Thomas | Willie McClurkin | Subject | Modeling |
| Douglas Stephens | Ericka Farmer | Years of Experience | Modeling |
| Melvin Flores | Dr. Uddell Madden | Science Coach | Modeling |
| Nakeshia Harris | Mashayla West | Subject Area | Modeling |
| Glen Soltes | Tracy Champagne | Subject Area | Modeling |

# 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

EGHS receives funds for improving basic education programs for the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Odyssey software licenses have been purchased and

professional development will be provided for Odyssey Ware.

Title I Director: Rose Raynack

### Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

### Title I, Part D

With the assistance of Title I, Part D, EGHS receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

### Title II

The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

### Title III

Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

### Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker, Ms. Sherrie Taylor, provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all Level 2 students.

### Violence Prevention Programs

East Gadsden High offers Youth Crime Watch and Men of Distinction programs to students which include field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

### Nutrition Programs

NA

### Housing Programs

NA

### Head Start

NA

### Adult Education

NA

### Career and Technical Education

Course choices for career interest and goals are evidenced by students choosing to participate in the Dual Enrollment program, taking advanced placement courses on campus, and participating in the career academy programs offered on campus, at Gadsden Technical Institute, and at the TCC-Pat Thomas Law Enforcement site.

### Job Training

Course choices for career interest and goals are evidenced by students choosing to participate in the Dual Enrollment program, taking advanced placement courses on campus, and participating in the career academy programs offered on campus, at Gadsden Technical Institute, and at the TCC-Pat Thomas Law Enforcement site.

### Other

## Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Dr. Kimball Thomas - Principal; Rebecca Gaines - Assistant Principal for Curriculum/Instruction; Carla Wells - Reading Coach; Tammy Sherman - Reading Teacher/Coach; Angela Sapp - Science Coach; Rhonda Cunningham - Math Coach; Julie McEachin - DOE Reading Specialist; Curtis Richardson - SIG Coordinator; Shirlean Thomas - Guidance Chair; Dimitri Salters - Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator; Anthony James - Behavior Specialist, and Linda Thomas - ESE Specialist

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?

> 1. Team meets bi-weekly to review ,monitor and implement operational changes regarding student performance data.
> 2. Team or individual members are designated to meet with other school teams(bi-weekly or monthly) to review, monitor and inform of student progressions needs or operational changes.

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 RtI Leadership Team reviews student progression data with respect to school improvement needs. Recommended changes based on this data was made to the SIP.

---

## MTSS Implementation

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

> Data sources that were analyzed were as follows: FLDOE School Grades and AYP Reports, District Baseline Data Reports, Write Scores Report, FAIR Assessment Reports through PMRN and Data Director.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> Comprehensive In-service and review of Florida's RtI Model.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

>

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> Dr. Kimball Thomas - Principal; Rebecca Gaines - Assistant Principal for Curriculum/Instruction; Carla Wells - Reading Coach; Tammy Sherman - Reading Teacher/Coach; Angela Sapp - Science Coach; Rhonda Cunningham - Math Coach; Julie McEachin - DOE Reading Specialist; Curtis Richardson - SIG Coordinator; Shirlean Thomas - Guidance Chair; Dimitri Salters - Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator; Anthony James - Behavior Specialist and Linda Thomas- ESE Specialist

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

> 1. Team meets bi-weekly to review ,monitor and implement operational changes regarding student performance data.
> 2. Team or individual members are designated to meet with other school teams(bi-weekly or monthly) to review, monitor and inform of student progressions needs or operational changes.

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

> To review literacy student progression data, i.e. reading and writing scores and make changes to instructional strategies to improve school-wide literacy, which is inclusive of Sustained Silent Reading( across the curriculum) and guided instruction for reading Novels, improving reading rigor through text complexity that will coordinate with Accelerated Reading initiatives.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

NA

## *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.

East Gadsden High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum, enrolled in Algebra I course before 9th grade, completed at least one level 3 high school math course only 1.2% below the district average, and completed Dual Enrollment (DE) math course was above the district average. These areas are above the state average, but East Gadsden High is focused on creating a greater emphasis on math preparedness. We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans. This will include sharing information and requirements to become eligible for Bright Futures. During common planning, teachers will review charts tracking graduation requirements and Bright Futures requirements and intervene as necessary.

## *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?

We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans.

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?

We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary 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

# 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | To increase the number of students scoring at achievement level 3 in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012 41%(91)students achieved a level 3 on FCAT Reading. | In 2013, 41% or more students are expected to maintain a level 3 or above on FCAT 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 |
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. | 1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals. | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. |
| 2 | 1.DifferentiatedInstruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for DI activities (lesson plans), grouping, management.<br>2. Rigor.<br>3. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers). | 1. Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through PLC's, Lesson Studies, and state/school mandates. The Reading Coach, Myra Grant will be responsible for progress monitoring and data collections of all assessments. Beginning the 2nd Nine weeks teachers will sign up to observe best reading practices/strategies used by other academic classes. They will then have biweekly cluster meetings and debrief with the Reading Coach. Suggestions will be given to the academic teachers for school based improvement. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students - teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students - teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students - teach, enrich. | Principal and Assistant Principals and the Reading Coach | FAIR,FCAT,FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. | FAIR, FCAT, Bi-Weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans IPDPs |

| | 2. Designing more rigorous lessons in lesson Study PLCs. 3. Data Chats between principal and teachers. 4. IPDP meetings with coaches. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | NA |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | To maintain or increase the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 16%(34) students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. | Students will score 16% or above Achievement Level 4 in FCAT 2.0 Reading. |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.Lack of across discipline collaboration. | 1. To provide in-service on across discipline collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading. | 1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines plan. |
| | DifferentiatedInstruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. | FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans, IPDPs. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 4. Rigor.<br><br>5. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers. | the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. 5.Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. 6.Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches. |

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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.<br><br>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.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | To maintain or increase the number of students making learning gains in reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48% of student made learning gains in reading. | 48% or higher of students will make learning gains 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 |
| 1 | 1.Lack of common goals for student success. | 1. To provide PD on common goals across disciplines for student success. | 1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team, Instructional Coaches, Department Chairs. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Common Goal Plan for students making learning gains. |
| 2 | Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. 4. Rigor.<br><br>Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers. | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be done through Tammy Sherman - reading coach. 2nd, 3rd, 4th period teachers will visit 6th and 7th periods and debrief during lesson study. Teachers will debrief on a bi-weekly basis. Focus on the planning, delivery,<br><br>assessment, and extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom Level 1 -teach, reteach, remediate Level 2-teach and reteach Level 3 - teach and enrich. Designing more standard aligned assessments lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches. | Principal, Assistant Principals, and Math Coach | FAIR,FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students based on mini-assessments.<br>Data chats will be held in all math classrooms. | FAIR, FCAT, Weekly focus lesson assessments, Bi-weekly Lesson Plans, IPDPs. |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | To maintain or increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 59% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. | 59% or more students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains 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 |
| 1 | 1. Lack of common goals for student success. | 1. To provide PD on across disciplines common planning goals for student success. | 1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team and Department Chairs. | 1. In-service/Workshops | 1. Across Discipline Common Goals Plan for students in the lowest 25 % making learning gains. |
| 2 | Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. Rigor.<br><br>Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers. | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches. | Principal and Assistant Principals and the Reading Coach | FAIR, FCAT, FCIM. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly. | FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments. Lesson Plans, IPDPs. |

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 | Reading Goal # |
|---|---|

school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

5A :

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 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 following subgroup:

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | To reduce the percentage of minority students not making satisfactory progress in reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 31% of minority students made satisfactory progress in reading, an increase of 13% from the previous year. | To increase the number of minority students making satisfactory progress 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. Rigor. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers. | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches. | Principal Asst. Principal for Curr., RTI Leadership Team. Reading Coach. | FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly. | FAIR, FCAT.Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans, IPDPs. |

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.<br><br>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 | 1.Lack of awareness and common goals for ELL students. | 1. To provide PD on ELL students learning strategies | 1.Principal, RtI Leadership Team, ESOL Teacher. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Across Disciplines Common Goals for ELL students success. |
| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | 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 | 1. lack of awareness of SWD learning strategies and common goals for success. | 1. Ti provide in-service and training for teachers with respect to common goals for SWD success. | 1. Principal, ELL Teacher, RtI Leadership Team. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys. | 1. Surveys/Common Goals for ELL students' success plan. |
| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | To reduce the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 31% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading. | To increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1. Lack of awareness and common goals for students that are economically disadvantaged success. | 1. To provide PD for teachers with respect to success for ED students. | 1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Common Success Goal Plan for ED students |
| 2 | DifferentiatedInstruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. Rigor. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers. | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. | Principal Asst. Principal for Curriculum Reading Coaches | FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly. | FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, lesson plans, IPDPs. |

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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| NA | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Lack of PD for faculty/staff that instruct ELL students. | 1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff. | 1. Principal, ELL Teacher, District ELL Coordinator. | 1. In-service/Workshops. | 1. The increase of ELL students scores on the CELLA in listening/speaking. |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in reading on the CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |

NA

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Lack of PD for ELL faculty/staff. | 1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff. | 1.Principal, District ELL Coordinator. | 1. In-service/Workshops | 1. Increased CELLA results in students scoring proficient in reading. |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in writing on the CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| NA | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. lack of PD for ELL faculty/Staff. | 1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff. | 1. Principal, District's ELL Coordinator. | 1. In-service/Workshops | 1. Increased CELLA Writing Proficiency results of ELL students. |

CELLA 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 CELLA Goals*

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

# 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

<div align="center">No Data Submitted</div>

## 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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | In June 2012- Projected 19% (35 students) Algebra I EOC students total (187) will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 EOC |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 33% of students scored at proficiency level on the Algebra 1 EOC | In Spring (May) 2013 - Projecting 50% of (200 students) Algebra 1 students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 EOC |

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. | 1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals. | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. |
| 2 | 1. Lack of Pacing of instruction and focus on lessons were not targeted accurately for the category of the test that was most tested which was Linear Equations, Inequalities and Functions | •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review<br><br>Refocus focus calendar<br><br>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DOE Math Specialist-Martha Gioeilli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Classroom walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principal observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
| | 2)Teacher need assistance and training with linking skills/chunking skills | •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly Lesson plans | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Math Coach, Mrs. | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Teacher Assessments | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough |

| | 3 | strategies | with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review<br><br>Refocus focus calendar<br><br>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed | Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DOE Math Specialist-Martha Gioeilli | •Classroom walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Principal observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 4 | 3)Lack of instructing rigorous problems, teaching using Complexity of problems and EOC assessments | •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DOE Math Specialist-Martha Gioeilli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Teacher Assessments<br><br>•Classroom walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principal observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
| | 5 | Traditional classroom teaching. Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies | Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies and professional development learning<br><br>Teachers will deliver lessons via SMART Board Activities, FCAT Explorer, in conjunction with math textbooks and other resources. | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DOE Math Specialist-Martha Gioeilli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Teacher Assessments<br><br>•Classroom walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principal observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
| | | Lack of Differentiated instruction activities in the classroom | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be done through lesson study with teachers and visitation of math and science classes. 4th period planning teachers will observe 3rd period teachers teaching and 3rd period planning teachers will observe 4th period teachers teaching on a bi-weekly basis. At the end of each lesson study a meeting will be held once a month to debrief with math coach. Focus on the planning, | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DOE Math Specialist-Martha Gioeilli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Teacher Assessments<br><br>•Classroom walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principal observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |

| 6 | delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom

Level 1 students (low performing level students)- teachers will teach, reteach, remediate

Level 2 (medium performing) students- teachers will teach and reteach

Level 3 (high performing students)-teachers will teach and enrich. | | | |

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: | In June 2012- Projected 19% (35 students) Algebra I EOC students total (187) will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 EOC |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 33% of students scored at proficiency level on the Algebra 1 EOC | In Spring (May) 2013 - Projecting 50% (200 students) Algebra 1 students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.Lack of across discipline collaboration. | 1. To provide in-service on across discipline collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading. | 1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines plan. |
| 2 | Lack of technology and technological interaction in classrooms | Provide Smartboard Interactive training to motivate teachers to incorporate technology tools in their lessons to ensure effective learning and enrichment and engagement | Principal ,Dr. Thomas

Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham

Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes

DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Lesson plans

•Classroom walkthrough

•Class implementation of interactive technology use for students and teachers

•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Lesson plans

•Classroom walkthrough/

•Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) |
| | Provide teachers with Common Core Introduction through the Eight Mathematical Practices, and Algebra I standards. | Teacher to Teacher PLC with Math Coach as facilitator on 8-mmathematical practices

Coach Regional meetings | Principal ,Dr. Thomas

Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham | •Lesson plan strategies

•Classroom implementation of the practices

•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC | •Lesson plans

•Classroom walkthrough/

•Lesson study/PLC documentation |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | | materials implemented in Classroom by teachers | Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) |
| 4 | Increase us of hands-on projects and enrichment activities through STEM training | Train the mathematics department on how STEM can increase motivation of students to learn math concept. Collaboration among math and science teacher on STEM activities. | Principal ,Dr. Thomas<br><br>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom implementation of the practices<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher PLC and Lesson study on STEM practices PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Classroom walkthrough/<br><br>•Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target |
|---|

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Algebra Goal #<br><br>3A : Decrease level 1 and 2 students and increase level 3 students using professional learning communities and school wide professional development to assist with instructional strategies. |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-20% | 29% | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra 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 |
| •Lack of Rigorous assessments used in the classroom and complexity of items aligned to EOC. | •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are | •Principal ,Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham | •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher lesson Study/ PLC<br><br>•Lesson plans with | •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | submitted will be submitted to the math coach for review | •ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted will be submitted to the math coach for review | •Student Performance EOC State Assessments proficieny results<br><br>•Classroom observation tools |
| 2 | •Provide training for clarification and sample math lessons to demonstrate to teachers what differentiation instruction looks like. | •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS and Teacher to Teacher PLC<br><br>•Lesson plans with differentiated activities<br><br>•Classroom implementation of differentiated activities | •Principal ,Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS and Teacher to Teacher PLC<br><br>•Lesson plans with differentiated activities<br><br>•Classroom implementation of differentiated activities | •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student Performance EOC State Assessments proficieny results<br><br>•Classroom observation tools |

| 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: | |
|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3C: | Data Not available from the District as of September 27, 2012 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| •State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains<br>•State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics<br>•State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics<br><br>• State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC | 50% of Algebra ELL students will perform Level 3 or higher on Algebra 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 |
| 1 | 1.Lack of awareness and common goals for ELL students. | 1. To provide PD on ELL students learning strategies | 1.Principal, RtI Leadership Team, ESOL Teacher. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Across Disciplines Common Goals for ELL students success. |
| 2 | Training to teacher for teaching ELL students | NcarPD training for all teachers | District personnel over NcarPD training<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Reading Coach | Implementation in classroom | School and State Assessment performance of students |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | In 2011-2012 : State results only 33% of all Algebra students who took the Algebra EOC pass with Level 3 or higher |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| •State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains<br>•State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics<br>•State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics<br>•State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC | 50% of the SWD (Students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Algebra will be placed in Access Algebra. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. lack of awareness of SWD learning strategies and common goals for success. | 1. Ti provide in-service and training for teachers with respect to common goals for SWD success. | 1. Principal, ELL Teacher, RtI Leadership Team. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys. | 1. Surveys/Common Goals for ELL students' success plan. |
| 2 | | Students will be placed in an Access algebra course | Principal<br><br>ESE Specialist | Math Coach will provide needed textbook and resources to teachers as needed | Assessments by ESE Specialist |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | In 2011-2012 33% of all Algebra students performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC who were enrolled in Algebra I. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| •State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains<br>•State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics<br>•State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics<br>•State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC | 2012-2013-50% of all math students in Algebra I will score a Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 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 |
| 1 | 1. Lack of awareness and common goals for students that are economically disadvantaged success. | 1. To provide PD for teachers with respect to success for ED students. | 1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Common Success Goal Plan for ED students |
| 2 | Teachers have a training of culture teaching students of all backgrounds | Students will be enrolled in Algebra I and inclusion students will also be enrolled in Algebra I and other learning challenged students will be enrolled in Access Algebra<br><br>Teachers have a training of culture teaching students of all backgrounds | Principal<br><br>ESE Specialist | Math Coach will provide needed textbook and resources to teachers as needed | ESE Specialist<br><br>Teacher evaluation<br><br>State performance on EOC |

*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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 17% (22) students were at state average 50 or higher on the Geometry EOC | In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry 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 |
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. | 1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals. | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. |
| 2 | •Pacing Guide nstruction and focus on lessons were not targeted accurately for the category of the test that was most tested two dimensional geometry | •Lesson study with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review<br><br>Refocus focus calendar<br><br>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed | Principal,Dr. Thomas<br><br>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principl Observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
| 3 | •Teacher need assistance with linking and chunking skills strategies through hands-on were demonstrated during monthly PLCs and Lesson Studies as facilitaed by Math Coach | •Lesson study with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review<br><br>Refocus focus calendar<br><br>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed | Principal,Dr. Thomas<br><br>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Lesson plans<br><br>•Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principl Observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student |

| | | | | | performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | •Lack of instructing rigorous problems, teaching using complexity of problems and EOC assessments | •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus<br><br>•Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review | Principal,Dr. Thomas<br><br>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •Lesson plans and Teacher Assessments<br><br>•Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principl Observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments |
| 5 | Lack of Teacher use of differentiation activities in the classroom | Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be done through lesson study with teachers and visitation of math and science classes. 4th period planning teachers will observe 3rd period teachers teaching and 3rd period planning teachers will observe 4th period teachers teaching on a bi-weekly basis. At the end of each lesson study a meeting will be held once a month to debrief with math coach. Focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom<br><br>Level 1 students (low performing level students)- teachers will teach, reteach, remediate<br><br>Level 2 (medium performing) students- teachers will teach and reteach<br><br>Level 3 (high performing students)-teachers will teach and enrich. | Principal,Dr. Thomas<br><br>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>FDLRS training<br><br>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli | •FDLRS Training materials<br><br>•Lesson plans and Teacher Assessments<br><br>•Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough<br><br>•Principl Observation<br><br>•Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments<br><br>•Student performance growth points on School Quarter 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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 and 5 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | | In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 17% (22) students were at state average 50 or higher on the Geometry EOC | | In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry 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 |
| 1 | 1.Lack of across discipline collaboration. | 1. To provide in-service on across discipline collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading. | 1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines plan. |
| 2 | •Lack of technology and technological interaction in classrooms | •Provide Smartboard Interactive training to motivate teachers and students to incorporate technology tools in their lessons to ensure effective learning and enrichment and engagement | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•Educational Transformation Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom Walkthrough<br><br>•Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Lesson plans<br><br>•CLassroom walkthrough<br><br>•Lesson study/PLC Documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms outline and lesson revisions) |
| 3 | Provide teachers with Common Core Instruction through the 8-mathematical practices and Algebra I standards | Teacher to teacher PLC with facilitation by Math Coach on 8-mathematical practices<br><br>Coach Regional Common Core Mathematical materials implementation during PLC | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•Educational Transformation Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom instruction implementation<br><br>•Common Core Learning goals plan<br><br>•Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom observations<br><br>•Common Core Learning goals plan<br><br>•Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) |
| | Increase us of hands-on projects and enrichment activities through STEM training | Train the mathematics department on how STEM can increase motivation of students to learn math concept. Collaboration | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom instruction implementation<br><br>•Common Core Learning | •Lesson plan strategies<br><br>•Classroom observations |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | among math and science teacher on STEM activities. | •Educational Transformation Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli | goals plan<br><br>•Teacher implementation in classroom of hands-on experiments, projects and other STEM related activities<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC on STEM activities documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) | •Common Core Learning goals plan<br><br>•Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) |

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal #<br><br>3A : Quarter Assessments and District School Baseline, midyear and spring assessments will reflect a learning goal of 15-20 point increase after implementation of Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development. |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No data availabl | | | | |

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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry 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 |
| 1 | •Lack of Rigorous assessments used in the classroom and complexity of items aligned to EOC. | •Lesson Study with rigor as the focus<br><br>•Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics Instructional | •Lesson study with rigor as the focus<br><br>•Teacher to Teacher lesson study/PLC<br><br>•Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review | •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring assessments<br><br>•Student Performance on EOC State assessments proficiency results and |

| | | | Specialist, Martha Gioielli | | •learning gains<br><br>•Classroom observation tools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | •Provide training for clarification and sample math lessons to demonstrate to teachers what differentiation instruction looks like | •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS<br><br>•Math Teacher to Science Teacher observation of classrooms<br><br>•Classroom implementation of differentiated activities<br><br>•STEM training assistance for teachers at regional meetings. | •Principal, Dr. Thomas<br><br>•Mathematics Coach Rhonda Cunningham<br><br>•ETO, Lillie Stokes<br><br>•DA Mathematics Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli | •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS and Teacher to Teacher PLC<br><br>•Lesson plans with differentiated activities<br><br>•Classroom implementation of differentiated activities | •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring assessments<br><br>•Student Performance on EOC State assessments proficiency results and learning gains<br><br>•Classroom observation tools |

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:

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3C: | Data Not available from the District |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| •State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains<br><br>•State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics<br><br>•State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics<br><br>•State Results: 17% of students in Geometry performed at state avg 50 or higher on Geometry EOC | In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry 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 |
| 1 | 1.Lack of awareness and common goals for ELL students. | 1. To provide PD on ELL students learning strategies | 1.Principal, RtI Leadership Team, ESOL Teacher. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Across Disciplines Common Goals for ELL students success. |
| 2 | Training to teach ELL students | NcarPD training for all teachers | District personnel over NcarPD training<br><br>ESE Specialist | Implementation in classroom | School and State Assessment performance of students |

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3D: | No data available for this group as of September 27, 2012 |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In 2011-2012: State results only 17% of Geometry students who took the Geometry passed with level 3 or higher | 2012-2013- 33% of the Geometry students will perform 3 or high on the Geometry 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 |
| 1 | 1. lack of awareness of SWD learning strategies and common goals for success. | 1. Ti provide in-service and training for teachers with respect to common goals for SWD success. | 1. Principal, ELL Teacher, RtI Leadership Team. | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys. | 1. Surveys/Common Goals for ELL students' success plan. |
| 2 | | Student will will be placed in Access Algebra course | Principal  ESE Specialist | Math coach will provided needed book resources | Assessments by ESE Specialist |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E: | In 2011-2012- 33% of all Algebra students performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC who were enrolled in Algebra 1. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| • State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains  • State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics  • State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics  • State Results: 17% of students in Geometry performed at state avg 50 or higher on Geometry EOC | 2012-2013 - 50% of all math students in Algebra I will score a level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 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 |
| 1 | 1. Lack of awareness and common goals for students that are economically disadvantaged success. | 1. To provide PD for teachers with respect to success for ED students. | 1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team | 1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys | 1. Common Success Goal Plan for ED students |
| 2 | Training of teachers to reach all modalities of learners and various background of students | Students will be enrolled in Algebra I and inclusion students will also be enrolled in Algebra I and other learning challenged students will be enrolled in Access Algebra  Teachers have a training of culture teaching students of all backgrounds | Principal, Dr. Thomas  Math coach, Rhonda Cunningham  ESE Specialist, Mrs. Linda Thomas | Teachers will have training to teach all students | Classroom walkthrough  Lesson plans  Lesson study/ PLC |

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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Biology Goal #1: | On the 2012 Biology 1 EOC 37% of the students performed at Tier 2 and T3 proficiency levels. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (T2 and T3)<br>31% (T2) 59 students<br>6% (T3) 12 students | On the Biology 1 EOC 42% of the students will score at T2 and T3 proficiency levels. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | 1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for | 1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for | 1.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. | strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals. | Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | | students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. |
| 2 | Inadequate non-traditional classroom experiences | Provide students with in depth exposure to activities, guest speakers and fieldtrips to enhance their background knowledge to assist in real world application of concepts and develop critical thinking skills as related to science. | Assistant Principal Curriculum, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson | Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be limited to following: Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments, Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and quarterly review of growth made by students. | Improvement on the science mini-assessments and district assessments. |
| 3 | Lack of rigorous instruction | Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies learned during NGCARPD, AP, and Bioscopes professional development, Biology Partnership, Lesson Study and Common Core State Standards.<br><br>Teachers will deliver lessons via SMART Board Activities, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO in conjunction with science textbooks and other resources.<br><br>AP class, and two STEM academies are available to provide avenues of acceleration for advanced learners.<br><br>Biology teachers use lesson plans that have been collaboratively created and developed by science teachers in Lesson Studies, Bioscopes, Curriculum Track and Biology partnership.<br><br>Professional Development on adopted science curriculum for full use of all components. Biology- Pearson Environmental – Pearson Chemistry –Pearson Physical Science – Pearson<br><br>Professional Development on supplemental planning for labs or stations in | Assistant Principal Curriculum, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson | Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be limited to following: Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments, Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and<br><br>quarterly review of growth made by students. | Improvement on the science mini-assessments and district assessments. |

| | | Chemistry, Physical Science and Earth Space Science | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Lack of laboratory experiences | Teachers will conduct laboratory experiences at least twice a week.<br><br>Labs supplies and materials have been ordered according to teachers' request and more are available upon request. | Assistant Principal Curriculum, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson | Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be limited to following:Laboratory Write-ups, Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments, Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and quarterly review of growth made by students. | Improvement on the science mini-assessments and district 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:

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.<br><br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*End of Science Goals*

# Writing Goals

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

| 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. <br><br> Writing Goal #1a: | To increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in writing by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 80% | 84% |

| 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 | Writing across the curriculum with fidelity. | All teachers will use preselected guided writing prompts on given days to assure fidelity. | RtI Leadership Team Principal, Asst. Principal, Reading Coach. | Monthly writing prompt data. | FCAT Writing. |

| 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.<br><br>Writing 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 | | | | |

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

| 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 |

## U.S. History End-of-Cource (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.<br><br>U.S. History Goal #1: | To score at the State's Baseline average. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | To score at the State's Baseline average. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. | 1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals. | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs. | 1.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3. |
| 2 | Lack of PD for Social Science teachers. | Provide PD fore Social Science Teachers. | Principal, District's k-12 Director, Social Science Department Chair. | In-service, Lesson Studys and workshops. | U.S. History EOC State's baseline results compared to EGHS results. |

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

| 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 | | | | | | |

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<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | 1. To increase the attendance rate from the previous year.<br>2.To reduce the number of excessive absences(10) or more and excessive tardies(10) or more. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 95 | 97 |

| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
|---|---|
| 254 | 204 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 291 | 239 |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Students apathy regarding school attendance and tardiness. | 1.1. Students will be given incentives during the grading period to attend school and to be on time for class. | 1.1. Drop-out Prevention Coordinator and Behavior Specialist | 1.1. Daily attendance reports will be reviewed and students will be counseled with respect to attendance/tardy progress. | Daily attendance reports. |
| 2 | 1.2. parent apathy regarding school attendance/tardies. | 1.2. Parents will be contacted when students miss school and get tardy referrals. | 1.2. Drop-Out Prevention coordinator and Behavior Specialist | 1.2 Daily Attendance Reports will be reviewed and parents called accordingly. | Daily attendance reports. Teacher call records. Automatic dialer reports. |
| 3 | 1.3. Teacher attendance record keeping. | 1.3. Teachers will be required to keep accurate daily attendance. | 1.3. Teachers, Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator and BehaviorSpecialist | 1.3 Teachers' daily attendance record per AS400 reports. | AS400 reports and teacher gradebooks. |

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<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | To reduce the number of students' in-school and out-of-schools suspensions from the previous year. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 534 | 208 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 309 | 128 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 719 | 220 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 338 | 130 |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Students lack os respect for each other, adult authority and school rules. | 1.1. Students will receive consistent review of school rules per the code of Student Conduct by teachers and via grade- | 1.1. Administration and teachers | 1.1 Student referrals, ISS, OSS reports will be reviewed bi-weekly. | Student referrals,ISS, OSS reports |

| level assembles. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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<br><br>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* | To reduce the percentage of dropouts by 2.7% and increase the percentage of graduates by 7%. |

| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: |
|---|---|
| 3.4% | 0.7% |
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |
| 74& | 81% |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.2. High number of FCAT Retakers/Adult students | 1.2 Provide FCAT ReTake tutorials for FCAT ReTakers including Adult Students | 1.2. Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator and Behavior Specialist | 1.2.1.1. FCAT Retakers will be identified by EWS reviews and assigned to tutoring in after-school and Saturday prep class. | FCAT-retake scores |

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 |

## 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<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | To increase the low percentage by encouraging parents to participate in Parents workshops and Family Reading Nights. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 35% | 50% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Parents not attending school events | Strategy 1.1. Encourage parents to participate in Family Reading Nights and Parents Workshops.<br><br>2. Offer monthly Reading Nights (9th Grade Academy)<br><br>3. Every Reading teacher calls parents within first three weeks of school to discuss students performance in class<br><br>4. Continue the School Advisory (SAC0 Parent EXPO's, Grade Level Parent Night Out's and School Parent Teacher Association (PTSA)<br><br>5. Investigate and implement the Golden School Award Program | Reading Coach and Parent Liaison<br><br>Volunteer Coordinator | Collect participation data and survey families<br><br>Administration will review parent-calling logs.<br><br>Agenda and Participation logs. | Parent Attendance Sign-In Sheets<br><br>Documented sign-in data from meetings and activities. |

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<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | 1. To increase the number of students participating in Level 3 STEM courses.<br>2. To increase the number of students that participate in science and engineering fairs.<br>3. To increase the number of students that compete in Regional/State science and engineering fairs.<br>4. To provide STEM PD for all teachers.<br>5. To provide PD for teachers in order to implement the integration of STEM reading and writing in study centers.<br>6. To provide STEM Pathway opportunities for students in feeder schools.<br>7. To increase partnership opportunities for STEM students. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of students meeting level 3 STEM courses requirements.<br>2.1 Lack of student interest in participating in science and technology engineering fairs.<br>3.1 Lack of student interest in science and engineering Regional/State fairs and competition.<br><br>4.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness.<br>5.1 Lack of PD and implementation strategies of teachers in order to integrate STEM reading/writing in study centers.<br>6.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness of STEM Pathway opportunities to feeder school students.<br>7.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness of partnership opportunities for STEM students. | 1.1 To provide knowledge and awareness of STEM to FCAT Level 3 or higher students and encourage their participation in STEM courses.<br>2.1 To promote and encourage science students participation in science and technology fairs.<br>3.1 To promote and encourage students to participation in science and technology fairs.<br>4.1 To provide faculty and staff with PD that makes them more knowledgeable and aware of STEM.<br>5.1 To provide PD for teachers in order to integrate STEM reading and writing in study centers.<br>6.1 To provide workshops/activities related to STEM Pathways opportunities to feeder school students.<br>7.1 To provide workshops/activities related to STEM partnership opportunities for students. | 1.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director<br>2.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director<br>3.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director<br>4.1 Principal, Science Coach, Math Coach, District RTTT Director and FLDOE STEM Specialist.<br>5.1 Principal, Science Coach, Math Coach, District RTTT Director and FLDOE STEM Specialist.<br>6.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director<br>7.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director | 1.1 Workshops/Surveys<br>2.1 Science/Engineering Fairs student workshops and field trips.<br>3.1 Science/Engineering Fairs student workshops and field trips<br>4.1 Lesson Studys.<br>5.1 Observations/PLCs<br>6.1 STEM Pathways workshops/Activities for feeder school students.<br>7.1 STEM Partnerships opportunities workshops/Activities for students . | 1.1 Increased student enrollment Level 3 STEM courses records.<br>2.1 Increased number of students particpating in science and engineering fairs.<br>3.1 Increased number of students participating in Regional/State science and engineering fairs.<br><br>4.1 Survey/Questionnaires<br>5.1 CWTs, Formative Evaluations<br>6.1 Increased number of STEM Pathways opportunities for feeder school students.<br>7.1 Increased number of STEM partnership opportunities for students |

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<br><br>CTE Goal #1: | 1. To increase the number of registered CAPE Programs.<br>2. To increase the number of teachers with Industry Certification.<br>3. To increase the number of teachers with CARPD/NGCARPD training.<br>4. To develop a CTE Advisory Council. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| | 1.1 Lack of awareness and knowledge of CAPE programs.<br>2.1 Number of teacher industry certification opportunities. | 1.1 To provide PD of CAPE Programs.<br>2.1 To provide more industry certification opportunities for teachers. | 1.1 Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist.<br>2.1 Principal, | 1.1 In-service/Workshop<br>2.1 In-service/Workshops<br>3.1 In-service/Workshops | 1.1 Surveys/Questioonares<br>2.1 Records of Industry Certified Teachers.<br>3.1 Records of number |

| 2 | 3.1 Lack of CARPD/NGCARPD awareness and training. 4.1 Lack of interest and awareness of CTE Advisory Councils. | 3.1 To provide CARPD/NGCARPD in-service/training for CTE teachers. 4.1 To plan and implement a CTE Advisory Council. | District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist. 4.1 Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist. Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist. | 4.1 In-service/Workshops | of CARPD/NGCARPD CTE Teachers. 4.1 Established CTE Advisory Council |

## 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.

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

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

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

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

1. To work in an advisory capacity and assist the school's administration carry-out and meet the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Gadsden School District
EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 18% | 58% | 67% | 15% | 158 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 32% | 65% |  |  | 97 | 3 ways to make gains: <br>● Improve FCAT Levels <br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 40% (NO) | 65% (YES) |  |  | 105 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 360 |  |
| Percent Tested = 99% |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | F | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

Gadsden School District
EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 16% | 58% | 83% | 13% | 170 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 31% | 69% |  |  | 100 | 3 ways to make gains: <br>● Improve FCAT Levels <br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 43% (NO) | 67% (YES) |  |  | 110 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned |  |  |  |  | 380 |  |
| Percent Tested = 98% |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* |  |  |  |  | D | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |