

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: DILLARD HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Casandra D. Robinson

SAC Chair: Andre' Meyers & Washington Woodburn

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Yolanda Williams	B.A. Degree in English from Duke University, Durham, NC M. ED. Degree in Counselor Education from North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC Ed. S. (Education Special) Degree in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University, Davie FL Credentials or Licenses (Certifications) Educational Leadership (All Levels) in the	11	13	Dillard High School Grade 2011-12 2010-11: B 2009-10: B 2008-09: D High Standards 2012- RD: 38%, MA: 53%, WR: 91% 2011- RD: 33%, MA: 79%, WR: 91%; SC: 32% 2010- RD: 26%, MA: 74%, WR: 92%; SC: 27% 2009- RD: 31%, MA: 72%, WR: 90%; SC: 23% Learning Gains 2012- RD: 63% 2011- RD: 55%; MA: 79% 2010- RD: 44%; MA: 81% 2009- RD: 45%, MA: 81%

		State of Florida Guidance and Counseling (PreK - 12) in the State of Florida English (Grades 6 - 12) in the State of Florida School Principal Cert.			Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: 2012- RD: 74% 2011- RD: 68%; MA: 73% 2010- RD: 41%; MA: 75% 2009- RD: 45%; MA: 80%
Assis Principal	Robert Levinsky	Bachelor of Arts in History with a minor in Education from University of Florida Master of Science in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University Certificates: SocS 6-12 Hist 6-12 Ed Leadership K-12 ESOL Endorsement	6	6	Dillard High School Grade 2011-12 2010-11: B 2009-10: B 2008-09: D High Standards 2012- RD: 38%, MA: 53%, WR: 91% 2011- RD: 33%, MA: 79%, WR: 91%; SC: 32% 2010- RD: 26%, MA: 74%, WR: 92%; SC: 27% 2009- RD: 31%, MA: 72%, WR: 90%; SC: 23% Learning Gains 2012- RD: 63% 2011- RD: 55%; MA: 79% 2010- RD: 44%; MA: 81% 2009- RD: 45%, MA: 81% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: 2012- RD: 74% 2011- RD: 68%; MA: 73% 2010- RD: 41%; MA: 75% 2009- RD: 45%; MA: 80%
Assis Principal	Ken Walton	M.S. Educational Leadership (Nova Southeastern Univ.) B. S. Business Administration (Bethune-Cookman Univ.) Certification: Bus Ed K-12 Ed Leadership K-12	9	9	Dillard High School Grade 2011-12 2010-11: B 2009-10: B 2008-09: D High Standards 2012- RD: 38%, MA: 53%, WR: 91% 2011- RD: 33%, MA: 79%, WR: 91%; SC: 32% 2010- RD: 26%, MA: 74%, WR: 92%; SC: 27% 2009- RD: 31%, MA: 72%, WR: 90%; SC: 23% Learning Gains 2012- RD: 63% 2011- RD: 55%; MA: 79% 2010- RD: 44%; MA: 81% 2009- RD: 45%, MA: 81% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: 2012- RD: 74% 2011- RD: 68%; MA: 73% 2010- RD: 41%; MA: 75% 2009- RD: 45%; MA: 80%
					Dillard High School Grade 2011-12 High Standards 2012- RD: 38%, MA: 53%, WR: 91% Learning Gains 2012- RD: 63% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: 2012- RD: 74% William Dandy Middle School 2005-2012 The school has been an 'A' school for the past 8 years. School Percent Scoring Three and Above 2010-2011 Reading 6th Grade 66% 7th Grade 64% 8th Grade 60% Mathematics

Principal	Casandra D. Robinson	Marketing 6-12, Educational Leadership	1	13	<p>6th Grade 74% 7th Grade 67% 8th Grade 79%</p> <p>Writing (8th Grade) 90%</p> <p>Science (8th Grade) 32%</p> <p>School Mean Scores 2010-2011</p> <p>Reading 6th Grade 314 7th Grade 312 8th Grade 319</p> <p>Mathematics 6th Grade 338 7th Grade 323 8th Grade 339</p> <p>Writing (8th Grade) 4.4</p> <p>Science (8th Grade) 304</p> <p>The school has not met the AYP requirements for the past four years. For the 2010-2011 the school did not make AYP in the following areas: reading and mathematics for the total number of students, black, and economically disadvantaged.</p>
Assis Principal	Wm. Alvin Barrow	B.S. Music Education, M.S. Educational Leadership, ED.S Technology Management		7	<p>William Dandy Middle School (previous assignment) The school has been an "A" school for the past eight years. Responsibilities: 8th grade, Reading, Social Studies, and Unified Arts.</p> <p>2010-2011 School Year (8th Grade)</p> <p>Reading 60% Mathematics 79% Writing 90% Science 32%</p> <p>Reading Mean Scale Score 319 Mathematics Mean Scale Score 339 Science Mean Scale Score 304 Writing Mean Scale Score 4.4</p> <p>The school did not make AYP for the 2010-2011 school year.</p>

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	Arlizia Smith	Bachelor of Science in Education and Humanities; Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum 5-9; Reading Endorsement K-12, and ESOL Endorsement	7	10	<p>2002-2005 William Dandy Middle School with a school performance grade of A during those 3 years;</p> <p>2005-Present Dillard High School- C, D, D, D, B, B .</p> <p>Lowest 25% at current school making sufficient learning gains in Reading to meet AYP criteria.</p>
		Ph.D Program, Masters in Administration and Supervision, Bachelor of Arts			1 year at William Dandy Middle School an A

English	Vanessia Blackshire	In English, ESOL Endorsement, Middle School and Reading Endorsements, Certified in English 6-12.	5	5	school; current school C, D, D with increases in Writing Performance. Current writing score is competitive to Schools' with similar demographics.
Math	Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques	BA in Mathematics certified (6-12)	6	10	4 years at William Dandy Middle with a performance of A, B, A, A; currently school C, D, D, D with increases in Mathematics performance each year and every qualified subgroup making learning gains and meet AYP.

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	Recruit: Experience Broward	Administration	3 times – Summer, Winter & Spring of 2009/10 School year.	
2	Recruit: Advertise for Teacher Vacancies	Administration, Office Manager	As needed	
3	District Job Fairs	District	On-going	
4	New teachers are required to attend the New Teacher Academy. They will receive an overview of course curriculum, effective instruction, and classroom management.	Administration	August 9 – 1 week prior to the start of school	
5	New teachers are assigned a coach/mentor via the New Educator Support System (NESS). Teachers attend monthly learning community meetings at the school site.	NESS Coach	August 16-20	
6	Teachers (other than new teachers) found in need of support will be provided a coach.	Administration and NESS Coach	On-going	

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
101	0.0%(0)	19.8%(20)	27.7%(28)	52.5%(53)	52.5%(53)	97.0%(98)	14.9%(15)	2.0%(2)	98.0%(99)

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
NA	NA		

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

The purpose of the Title I program is to support the school efforts to ensure that all children meet challenging academic standards and have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. This purpose will be accomplished by providing the following Programs:

Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) - after school tutorial sessions

Professional Development - provide workshops and conferences for staff

Parental Involvement and Resource Center - parent university

District/School Parent Involvement - school/parent involvement plan, SAC

Highly Qualified Instructors

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/a

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before, and after school (Panthers in Progress, PIP), and for additional instructional support during the school day. 21st Century Grant

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that include field trips, community service, and counseling. School based Student Crime Watch Program partners with Fort Lauderdale Police Officers.

Nutrition Programs

Students are encouraged to participate in the free and reduced meal program, if eligible. It is strongly recommended and encouraged for all students to eat both breakfast and lunch to help maintain nutritional wellness. Students receive additional

nutritional information through their science, health and culinary arts classes.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Emerging Computer Technology Magnet Program Certification Programs

Vocational Certification Programs

Job Training

Yes-through internships (magnet, SLC and CTE) and OJT/DCT programs

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI team consists of the following members: ESE Specialist (facilitator), grade level administrators, grade level guidance counselors, teachers, ESE Counselor, school psychologist, school social worker, S&L pathologist and ESOL coordinator.

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The RtI meets once per week. The RtI Facilitator is responsible for notifying the Team as to which cases will be brought up for discussion. Additionally, he is also responsible for maintaining written records for the Team, The facilitator will maintain a log containing information gathered for Tier 1 & Tier 2 interventions. Each grade level administrator/counselor is responsible for bringing new cases to the Team, as well as collecting / monitoring data as students move through the appropriate Tiers. Identification of student issues is based on discussions from weekly grade level team meetings. These grade level team meetings also serve as a forum for discussion regarding student progress with interventions developed at the weekly RtI Team meetings. The school psychologist, ESE Counselor, school social worker and S&L pathologist bring their respective areas of expertise to RtI Team discussions.

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 problem solving process at Dillard HS is linked to the SIP in the following manner: 1. identifying and developing interventions for students who are struggling in the areas of reading, math, science & writing and 2. Providing data for the refinement and adjustment of IFCs in the areas of reading & math. In addition, data collected during the RtI process (ie referrals, attendance, FBA/BIP) will provide, in part, documentation regarding the effectiveness of the school-wide approach to behavior management at Dillard.

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 include the following: 1. Baseline data may include Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), bi-weekly mini assessments, monthly practice tests, end of chapter tests for reading; 2. Test of Math Abilities (TOMA), FCAT aligned monthly tests, end of chapter tests for math; 3. Baseline writing test,

bi-weekly writing prompts for writing; 4. Science mini assessments & FCAT science exam scores for science and 5. frequency charts, scatter plots, ABC charts & on/off task charts for behavioral issues. Once interventions have been suggested by the RtI Team and baseline data has been established for struggling students, teachers will use: Tier One documentation form which describes the presenting problem & student response to the problem; 2. Tier Two documentation form which describes a more specific intervention, baseline data and a progress monitoring measure of 8 weeks and 3. Tier Three documentation form which describes the most specific intervention, baseline data and a progress monitoring measure of 8 weeks.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff development will be delivered by the RtI facilitator & School Psychologist on a quarterly basis during teacher planning sessions. The dates scheduled are as follows: week of 9/12/11, 10/31/11, 1/23/12 & 4/23/12. These sessions will describe the RtI process in general (general ed initiative, shift from eligibility to outcomes, what each tier constitutes, progress monitoring data collection & focus on academics, behavior, attendance) and describe and clarify the Dillard HS process in particular (establish teacher roles, how to access tier forms, identify the student issue & establish baseline data, how to progress monitor).

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Dillard High Literacy Leadership team consists of the Principal and the Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Science Coach, ESE Specialist, ESOL Specialist, , Department Heads, Magnet Coordinators and Guidance Staff. This team also functions as the school-based leadership team to facilitate identified school needs. These members were selected to facilitate and support school-wide reading initiatives and the professional development needs of staff.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets bi-weekly and looks at departmental and school-wide data, disseminates information, and adjusts plans when necessary. Each team member is responsible for ensuring that the various initiatives are shared, modeled, and monitored within their respective departments. These members also help to develop the curriculum-based integration between reading and individual content areas. This encompasses lesson plans, thematic units, and interdisciplinary teaching teams.

The Literacy Leadership Team members review the Reading Goals of the school improvement plan then report to their respective departments to refine and adjust Instructional Focus Calendars as recommended by the analysis of reading data by the Leadership Team. The reading data that is analyzed is generated from previous FCAT Data, District BAT, FAIR, Classroom Walkthroughs and school-based monthly assessments. This data directly addresses the learning and intervention needs of the students.

The Literacy Leadership Team establishes the learning culture by providing reading professional development that will lead to student achievement and professional growth opportunities for staff.

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

The Literacy Team will also continue the school-wide reading and writing initiative of "Word of the Day" in which students are exposed to SAT and high frequency words and weekly writing. The words are shared over the PA system and both teachers and students are encouraged to use the word during the week in their conversations and lessons. The LLT will focus on improving the achievement of the lowest 30% of students in Reading. The LLT will meet in the fall to review the plan which incorporated a school-wide initiative based on the work of Larry Bell. During the fall of 2010, all staff members participated in a site-based refresher of Larry Bell's instructional strategy workshop and received supporting material. Larry Bell's work focuses on "12 Powerful Words" that improve student performance on standardized tests. His techniques incorporate auditory, visual, and kinesthetic modalities to assist students in learning key terms found in questions that require a cognitive response. His work also infuses strategies that support the understanding of text features and strategic reading processes (UNRAaVEL) to aid comprehension.

The Literacy Leadership Team will facilitate professional learning communities focused on differentiating instruction, reading in the content areas, academic vocabulary and instructional strategies. There will be model classrooms by department that will

be available to support teachers in each discipline as they integrate reading strategies into their individual classrooms.

The Literacy Team will also promote the school-wide use of the web-based product, Study Island. This product was purchased to support the college and career readiness goals of the school. The program provides support and practice through its standards-mastery programs, AP programs, developmental reading and math programs and college and career planning modules for high school students. The 2012 software updates now include student practice based on the Common Core Curriculum Frameworks.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

- All new reading teachers will be trained by the District on the delivery of specific, applicable, reading programs. Currently, 3 vocational teachers have completed the CAR-PD bundle and will be scheduled for the NGCAR-PD Refresher, 8 reading teachers are reading endorsed and 1 is reading certified.
- Reading Coach will provide ongoing training on the interpretation of reading data gathered from the 2011 FCAT and monthly mini assessments (including the District Benchmark Assessment Test) and remediation techniques.
- Reading Coach will provide ongoing training on instructional strategies to support reading in the content areas.
- All teachers will be offered weekly learning communities for reading addressing each FCAT 2.0 benchmark to infuse reading strategies and reading across the content area.
- All content-area teachers not previously trained in CRISS or McRel will be offered training in the fall of 2011 and the spring of 2012 to assist with creating engaging, motivating learning environments for students.
- The Literacy Leadership Team will train all teachers in the fall of 2011 on the implementation of "Panther Success Strategies". These reading-based strategies will be implemented into the lesson plans and instruction of all content area teachers as an ongoing part of the school-wide literacy support process.
- All teachers will implement Larry Bell's UNRAAVEL reading strategy and 12 Powerful Words into the classroom instruction as a part of a school-based initiative.
- The school has implemented a school-wide Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum process that ensures that all departments actively participate in the school's reading and writing initiative. This program incorporates the Word of the Day vocabulary strategy and elaboration through writing.

*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?

Reading & Writing: The school has implemented a school-wide Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum process that ensures that all departments actively participate in the school's reading and writing initiative.

Mathematics: Math teachers are encouraged to use real world experiences and problem-solving examples in their teaching for students to see the validity and relevance of what is being taught. The Math Coach models this process with the math teachers who in turn model it throughout the classrooms for their students.

Science: Science teachers are encouraged to use real world experiences in their teaching for students to see the validity in what they are learning. The Science Coach models this process with the science teachers. The science teachers model it throughout the classrooms.

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?

1. All students are required to create and make frequent visits to the FACTS.org website to update their individual "electronic personal education plan" (e pep). Students will be able to track academic progress (bright futures eligibility and course work completed to meet graduation requirements) as it relates to their personal interests and career goals. Students will also have the opportunity to navigate the "Choices Planner" through FATS.org. Students are expected to use this online resource to compare, connect, and choose career and educational options that will enable them to build postsecondary plans that are realistic and attainable.
2. The "Annual Guidance Plan" (AGP) is implemented and serves as a guide for counselors to conduct classroom and small group advisement to students regarding career and educational planning.
3. Students are placed in courses that meet graduation, bright futures, state university system (SUS), and technical/career postsecondary requirements. In addition, it is a school-wide initiative to place students into a vocational program of study (for programs not offered at DHS, we encourage students to enroll at the technical school) with the presumption that students will meet course requirement for whichever academic or career path he/she choose to follow.
4. Students at the 11th and 12th grade level are oriented and encouraged to utilize the ACT – "World of Work" website to explore academic/career options. Students are expected to gain knowledge of the career of interest as it relates to job description, high school and college learning objectives, degrees available in the interested career area, and related occupations.
5. Service Learning – students are counseled to seek and select volunteer opportunities related to a potential future career choice.
6. Continuing in the 2011 – 2012 school year, students will have the opportunity to participate in an after school course that will focus on Resume Writing, College Application Essay Writing and Scholarship Essay Writing.
7. Science: Students are exposed to information about careers in which the knowledge of science is needed. The teachers also discuss science course options/choices with the students to ensure that course selections will be meaningful. All teachers are encouraged to do the same in their content area of study.

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](#)

1. Virtual Counselor scheduling program and course progression charts are used to default students into rigorous and sequential course that meet postsecondary requirements.
2. To measure student skills needed for college, all 10th grade students will take the PSAT.
3. 11th grade students are also given the opportunity to participate in the PSAT administration to compete for the National Merit Scholarship.
4. The "AP Potential" report is utilized to identify students for placement in Advanced Placement Courses.
5. Eligible 11th grade students will take the CPT. Students area (s) of weakness will be addressed by providing students the opportunity to enroll in remedial courses during their senior year. – Math for College Readiness/Reading for College Readiness.
6. Students are oriented and encouraged to utilize "My College Quickstart" website to create a study plan for success on the SAT, explore college matches based on the student's individual skills accessed on the PSAT, and major/career matches.
7. Students will have the opportunity to participate in SAT and ACT prep courses during and after school.
8. Students in the 11th grade participate in the annual district sponsored College Fair. Students in the 11th and 12th are encouraged to participate in other online, on campus and off-campus college fairs/information session.
9. 11th and 12th grade students are counseled to work toward receiving college credits while in high school by enrolling dually in one of the contracted public universities, or technical school. Students in the 12th grade meeting the requirements for early admissions are encouraged to do so.
10. Students in the 12th grade are exposed to and encourage o apply for the various scholarships available to them. Students in the 11th grade are encouraged to start researching and preparing to apply for scholarships at the appropriate

time.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 28% (248) of students will attain proficiency on the Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 24% (185) of students attained a level 3 on the Reading FCAT.	In 2013, 28% (248) of students will achieve a level 3 on the Reading FCAT.

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 Demonstrated student deficiencies in comprehension.	1.1 Students will utilize the Study Island standards-based mastery program and the developmental reading program. Both programs provide content specific literacy practice using a variety of formats including a game mode to engage and motivate readers.	1.1 Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher	1.1 *Study Island performance data will be used to monitor student progress. *Bi-weekly mini-assessments and Monthly Reading assessments and (including the District Benchmark Assessment Test) will be administered to 9th and 10th graders to provide ongoing monitoring of FCAT readiness. •FAIR will be used to progress monitor. • Student portfolios will be used.	1.1 BAT Data Analysis, FAIR, Study Island Performance Reports
2	Reading strategies and instruction need to occur school-wide.	A Comprehensive Reading Plan will be implemented across the curriculum. The plan will include target areas of instruction within the benchmarks, an instructional focus calendar, staff development, resource support and an accountability and assessment component. Each department will support the instructional focus benchmarks that will be covered by using content-based reading selections.	Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Administrators	Teachers will be monitored and observed on a weekly basis for implementation of the District K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan components in lesson plans and practice. • Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. • Monthly Benchmark Assessments (August-May)	•District Benchmark Assessment (September and December)

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bi-Weekly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (September-February) • Monthly Reading mini-assessments (including the District Benchmark Assessment Test) will be administered to 9th and 10th graders to provide ongoing monitoring of FCAT readiness. Data will be reviewed and analyzed for instructional purposes. *Classroom Walkthrough Tool with a focus on instructional delivery. 	
3	Content Area Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will develop a bank of reading comprehension and stamina building strategies to be implemented in the content areas & applied to academic plans such as context clues, QAR techniques, graphic organizers & text frames. • Teachers will include context-based reading selections and focus on the benchmarks in alignment with those covered across the curriculum in their lesson plans. 	Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Administrators	Bi-Weekly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (September-February)	Mini-Assessment Data Analysis
4	Appropriate strategies and interventions	<p>Students will be administered the FAIR assessment and receive appropriate instruction using the results of the Targeted Diagnostic Inventory.</p> <p>* Teachers will be encouraged to utilize the newly revised IFC's and corresponding lessons in BEEP</p>	Reading Coach, Reading and English Teachers	<p>Monthly Data Chats with teachers and PLCS to interpret data and instructional implications</p> <p>*Coaching sessions with Reading teachers to discuss lesson planning & lesson development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing Progress Monitoring • PMRN Data

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring at levels 4,5,or 6 will be 30% on FAA reading,
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 23% (3) students scored at levels 4, 5 and 6 on FAA reading.	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring levels 4,5 or 6 will be 30% (4).

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
	Demonstrated student deficiencies in word	Students scoring at level 1 or 2 on FAA reading will	Department Chair	monthly reading assessments	practice FAA test materials, teacher

1	recognition, decoding and comprehension skills.	receive research based instruction through use of the Shining Star reading program.		made/curriculum tests.
---	---	---	--	------------------------

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. Reading Goal #2a:	By June, 2013, 18% (160) of the tested population will exceed proficiency in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13.2% (101) of the tested population exceeded proficiency in reading on the 2012 administration of the FCAT.	18% (160) of the tested population will exceed proficiency in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.

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	Teachers lack implementation of challenging and rigorous curriculum	Challenge students with Project-based learning/ WebQuest Utilize varies complexity of text within instruction Blooms Taxonomy question stems	Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	Project Presentations Bi-weekly Mini Assessments	Project Presentations BAT Data FAIR Data 2013 FCAT 2.0 Data
2	Implementing higher order questioning within daily instruction	Project-based instruction with high-interest tasks Teachers utilize FCAT Item Specs within daily instruction Higher-frequency inclusion of informational text –based sources	Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	Rubrics from evaluations Bi-Weekly Benchmark Assessments	Project Presentations Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0
3	Students who are at Level 4 may be at risk of dropping to Level 3	Implement individualized tutoring: PUSH-IN, PULL-OUT plan	Reading Coach	Data Chats	Bi-weekly Mini-Benchmark Assessments FAIR Data Reports 2013 FCAT 2.0 Data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By June, 2013, 45% (6) of students will score at or above level 7 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 38% (5) of students scored at or above level 7 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	In 2013, 45% (6) of students will score at or above level 7 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

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	Demonstrated student deficiencies in decoding and comprehension skills	Students scoring at or above level 7 in FAA reading will receive research based instruction through the Wilson Reading program.	Department Chair	monthly reading assessments	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June, 2012: 65% (577)of the tested population will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62.8% (460) of the tested population made learning gains in reading on the 2012 administration of the FCAT.	65% (577) of the tested population will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.

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	Appropriate Intervention Based on Identified Student Needs.	All 9th & 10th Grade students scoring at levels 1 & 2 on the 2011 FCAT will receive research-based reading instruction through specific reading classes and will be placed according to the District High School Struggling Readers Chart using District approved diagnostic tools.	Reading Coach and Guidance Director	Master Schedule and Progress Monitoring Tools (FORF, DAR, FAIR)	Monitoring and Analysis of Data gathered from the DAR, FORF, & FAIR
2	Reading support needs to be the focus of all teachers within all content area to support student needs for informational and literary text analysis.	A school-wide initiative of reading benchmark support by infusing SSS and FCAT strategies within the curriculum will be implemented. School wide Reading Instructional Focus Calendar to be followed in content area instruction.	Reading Coach Assistant Principal of reading	Bi-weekly mini benchmark assessments. Data chats of both mini and BAT I and II assessments.	Mini Assessments
3	Students functioning on varying individual levels of reading ability need differentiated instructional techniques.	Using the results of the FAIR assessment, teachers will monitor student progress and use the data to inform instruction and use targeted differentiated instruction to meet student learning needs.	Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Administrators	FAIR Progress Monitoring Tool	FAIR (PMRN Database)

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	By June, 2013, 45% (5) of the tested population will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37.3% (4) of the tested population made learning gains in reading on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment	45% (4) of the tested population will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning on various reading levels require differentiated instruction to address individual skill deficits.	Teachers will drive instruction based on individual students performance on teacher tests, Shining Star and Wilson Reading program results.	Department Chair	monthly reading assessments	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June, 2013: 78% (172) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (142) of the students in lowest 25% made learning gains in reading on the 2012 administration of the FCAT.	78% (172) of the students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.

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	Instructional Strategies and Targeted Intervention	Differentiated instruction will be provided to the ESE, ELL, and the bottom 30% students who did not meet AYP criteria using appropriate strategies (District Instructional Strategies matrix) and materials as outlined in the District Instructional Materials List and FAIR instructional implications. *Teachers will use the newly revised District IFC's and corresponding BEEP lessons that promote rigorous instruction, collaborative learning, motivation and confidence building.	Reading Coach, Administrators, ELL Specialists	Performance on monthly reading practice tests and bi-weekly assessments, FAIR, BAT and program assessments.	Analysis of data gathered from monthly reading practice tests and biweekly assessments, FAIR, BAT and program assessments.
	Differentiating Instruction	Vocabulary through Morphemes: a research-	Reading Coach	Monthly Data Chats	Analysis of data gathered from

2		based program. This Tier 3 intervention will be administered daily		Performance on monthly reading practice tests and in-program assessments.	monthly reading practice tests and in-program assessments.
3	Developmentally Appropriate Interventions	All 9th & 10th Grade students scoring at levels 1 & 2 on the 2011 FCAT will receive research-based reading instruction through specific reading classes and will be placed according to the District High School Struggling Readers Chart using District approved diagnostic tools. *FAIR data will outline a Targeted Diagnostic Inventory that teachers will use to address the specific needs of individual students based on their performance.	Reading Coach	Monitoring and analysis of the FAIR data	FAIR

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June, 2013, the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5% within each ethnic subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The following subgroups did not make adequate yearly progress in reading on the 2012 administration of the FCAT. White: 22% (8) Black: 67% (448) Hispanic: 31% (14) Asian: 50% (1) American Indian: 0	The number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5% within each ethnic subgroup. White: 17% () Black: 62% () Hispanic: 26% () Asian: 0% (0) American Indian: 0

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 test-taking strategies, active reading strategies and stamina when reading lengthy grade- level passages.	Bi-weekly mini-assessments will be administered at the completion of a benchmark or cluster of benchmarks. Reading Coach will provide follow-up staff development for	Reading Coach, Administrators	Review of results from mini-assessments, Classroom learning centers created in response to data gathered from mini-assessments	FCAT Focus Study Island Reports Bi-weekly analysis of reporting category assessments.

		remediation or enrichment.			
2	A lack of Differentiated Instruction to address the individual student needs.	Classroom learning centers created in response to data gathered from mini-assessments * Teachers will use the newly revised District IFC's and the corresponding BEEP lessons that promote rigorous instruction, collaborative learning, motivation and confidence building.	Reading Coach, Administrators, Guidance Director	Master Schedule and Progress Monitoring Tools (FORF, DAR, FAIR); Data chats with teachers	Monitoring and Analysis of Data gathered from the DAR, FORF, & FAIR
3	Appropriate instructional strategies and curriculum-based intervention	A Comprehensive Reading Plan will be implemented across the curriculum. The plan will include target areas of instruction within the benchmarks, an instructional focus calendar, staff development, resource support and an accountability and assessment component. Each department will support the instructional focus benchmarks that will be covered by using content-based reading selections.	Reading Coach	Professional Learning Community *Teacher lesson plans *Classroom Walkthroughs with a focus on instructional delivery.	Monitoring and Analysis of information gathered from FCAT Focus Mini- Assessments, Study Island performance reports and monthly assessment data.
4	Lack of student strategies that encourage ownership and independence in the learning process.	Student workshops will be provided offering remediation and enrichment in the annually assessed benchmarks. Teachers will be trained in and implement CRISS/McCrel Strategies as a part of the instructional process.	Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Administrators	Review of results from the FCAT Focus mini-assessments and monthly assessments. Data Chats with teachers *Teacher Lesson Plans with research based embedded strategies.	FCAT Focus Mini-Assessment data, Monthly Assessment data, District BAT
5	A need for instruction that targets individual student performance and ability.	Students will be administered the FAIR assessment and receive appropriate instruction using the results of the Targeted Diagnostic Inventory.	Reading Coach, Technology Specialist, Administrator	Data Chats and Professional Learning Communities with teachers discussing the interpretation of the PMRN reports and the instructional implications.	Ongoing Progress Monitoring data from FAIR,

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June, 2013, the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
93% (29) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading based on the 2012 FCAT.	The number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5% within the ELL subgroup-87%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Developmentally Appropriate Interventions	Instruction through the High School Developmental Language Arts (Shining Star) Program will be used to address the remediation and enrichment of ELL students.	Reading Coach, ELL Liaison, Developmental LA Teacher	Monthly Data Chats Performance on monthly reading practice tests and in-program assessments	Analysis of data gathered from monthly reading practice tests and in-program assessments.
2	Instructional Strategies and Targeted Intervention	Differentiated instruction will be provided to the ELL students who did not meet AYP criteria using appropriate strategies (District Instructional Strategies matrix) and materials as outlined in the District Instructional Materials List and FAIR instructional implications. *Teachers will use the newly revised District IFC's and corresponding BEEP lessons that promote rigorous instruction, collaborative learning, motivation and confidence building.	Reading Coach, ELL Liaison, Developmental LA Teacher	Performance on monthly reading practice tests and bi-weekly assessments, FAIR, BAT and program assessments.	Analysis of data gathered from monthly reading practice tests and biweekly assessments, FAIR, BAT and program assessments.
3	Students functioning on varying individual levels of reading ability need differentiated instructional techniques.	Using the results of the FAIR assessment, teachers will monitor student progress and use the data to inform instruction and use targeted differentiated instruction to meet student learning needs.	Reading Coach, ELL Liaison, Developmental LA Teacher	FAIR Progress Monitoring Tool	FAIR (PMRN Database)

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June, 2013, the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (431) of economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading based on the 2012 FCAT.	The number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of independent Learning Strategies and Differentiated instructional strategies.	Teachers will be trained in CRISS and McRel and will integrate the strategies into their lessons and instruction	5E.1. Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Assistant Principals	Classroom Walkthroughs, Teacher developed lesson plans, student portfolios	Study Island Performance Data and Mini-Assessment Data

2	Lack of instructional interventions to address individual student needs.	Teachers will be trained in and administer FAIR. Data from this assessment will be used to identify and target instruction.	Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher developed lesson plans and learning centers	PMRN Data
3	Lack of Instructional planning that supports the needs of diverse learners	Teachers will use the newly revised District IFC's and corresponding BEEP lessons that promote rigorous instruction, collaborative learning, motivation and confidence building.	Reading Coach	Teacher lesson plans, Data Chats with Reading Coach and Administrative feedback, Classroom Learning Centers, student portfolios	Grade Related software, PMRN Data

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June of 2012, 36% (285) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress in Reading on the 2011 administration of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As identified by the 2011 administration of the FCAT, 28% (145) of the students in the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged met Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading	By June of 2012, 36% (285) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress in Reading on the 2011 administration of the FCAT.

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 independent Learning Strategies and Differentiated instructional strategies	Teachers will be trained in CRISS and McRel and will integrate the strategies into their lessons and instruction.	Reading Coach, Department Chairs and Assistant Principals	Classroom Walkthroughs, Teacher developed lesson plans, student portfolios	FCAT Focus Mini-Assessment Data
2	Lack of instructional interventions to address individual student needs.	Teachers will be trained in and administer FAIR. Data from this assessment will be used to identify and target instruction.	Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher developed lesson plans and learning centers	PMRN Data
3	Lack of Instructional planning that supports the needs of diverse learners	Teachers will use the newly revised District IFC's and corresponding BEEP lessons that promote rigorous instruction, collaborative learning, motivation and confidence building.	Reading Coach	Teacher lesson plans, Data Chats with Reading Coach and Administrative feedback, Classroom Learning Centers, student portfolios	Grade Related software, PMRN Data

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

Common Core Anchor Standard 4	9-12	Arlizia Smith, Reading Coach	School-wide	August 15, 2012 (Pre-planning Week)	Job-embedded lesson plans	Department Chairs, Grade level Administrator
NGSSS Benchmark and Strategies Training	Reading	Reading Coach	9th -12th grade teachers	Bi-Weekly beginning September 18, 2012	FCAT Focus data, Study Island Data, Job-Embedded Follow-Up Activity, Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthrough with a focus on instructional delivery, Data Chats	Reading Coach, Administrators
Integrating Reading Strategies into the Content Area Classroom	9-12 All Subject Areas	Reading Coach	School-wide	Bi-Weekly beginning September 18, 2012	Job-Embedded Follow-Up Activity, Teacher Lesson Plans, Student Samples, Classroom Walkthrough Tool	Reading Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.
CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.
CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	By June 2013, 35% (7) Florida Alternate Assessment Students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28.6%(4)Florida Alternate Assessment Students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics	35% (7) Florida Alternate Assessment Students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning on various math levels require the use of differentiated instruction & manipulatives to address their individual skill deficits.	Teachers will use data from teacher made/curriculum tests to differentiate instruction.	Department chair	monthly math exams	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	By June 2013, 43% (6) Florida Alternate Assessment Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35.7% (5) Florida Alternate Assessment Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	43% (6) Florida Alternate Assessment Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.

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	Demonstrated student deficits in computation skills	Students scoring at or above level 7 on FAA math will receive research based instruction through Moving with Math program	Department chair	Monthly math assessments	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students	
--	--

making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:		By June 2013, 45%(202) students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Mathematics.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
June 2012, 37% (155) FCAT 2 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.		45%(202) students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Mathematics.			
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	Demonstrated skill deficits in the areas of computation & problem solving.	Using results of monthly math assessments, class performance and teacher made/curriculum tests, teachers will differentiate instruction to address individual skill deficits.	Department chair	monthly math assessments	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:		By June 2013, 45% (203) Students will be scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1 End of The Course Exams.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
June 2012, 37%(155)Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1 End of The Course Exams.		45% (203) Students will be scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1 End of The Course Exams.			
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	Teachers lack of familiarity with new textbooks resource materials.	Teachers will identify common focus. Textbooks resource trainers will come to give professional development to the mathematics department of what resources available within the textbooks series. Teacher will discuss what resources they will use to improve learning and the teaching methodology. Implementation of the living curriculum and reflection of what is or not working.	Math curriculum coach, Grade level administrators	Classroom Walk Through (CWT) will be conducted weekly by Grade Level administrators, Math Coach, Department Chairs to focus on the usage of textbook resources. Data chats with the teachers will be conducted to discuss CWT results and a future plan of actions.	District BAT and bi-weekly benchmark assessments, Monthly End of Course (EOC) practice Assessment, and Content Area common assessment.

	Analysis of curriculum and programs will be ongoing by administrators, coaches, and department chair to ensure appropriate instruction and adherence to curriculum map, created by the mathematics department or provided from the district.		
--	--	--	--

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:	By June 2013, 20% (90) students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 15.8%(66) students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	20%(90) students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty transitioning from FCAT to EOC.	Students will practice EOC once a week during their math classes on the laptop cart. Students will have access code to Pearson to practice EOC at home. Mock EOC will be administered to students in order to assess EOC readiness. Testing dates will be September 2012, October 2012, November 2012, January 2013, February 2013, March 2013.	Mr.Barrows, Grade 9 Administrator, Mrs. Williams, Grade 10 Administrator, and Mr. Jean-Jacques, Math Coach will use classroom walkthrough to monitor	Math Coach will schedule the usage of the laptop cart with the teachers. Math Coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessments to ensure that interventions are targeted to areas of deficit.	Pretest EOC 2012, Monthly EOC Practice, District EOC 1, District EOC 2, and Posttest EOC 2013

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 #					
	By June 2013, 60% of the students will score an achievement of level 3 in Algebra I EOC.					
3A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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. Algebra Goal #3B:	By June 2013, 40% (160)student subgroups Black will not making satisfactory progress in Algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 49.6 % (184)student subgroups Black not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: 23.5%(4) Black: 49.6%(184) Hispanic: 36.4%(8) Asian:0%(0) American Indian: NA	40%(160)Student subgroups Black not making satisfactory progress in Algebra White: reduced to 2 Black: reduced to 40% (160) Hispanic: reduced to 5 Asian: 0%(0) American Indian: 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				

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. Algebra Goal #3C:	By June 30%(15)English Language Learners ELL not making satisfactory progress in Algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 45.5%(5)English Language Learners ELL not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	A decreased of 15% of English Language Learners ELL not making satisfactory progress in 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	Teachers lack use of Differentiated Instructional Strategies (DI).	Discussion within the mathematics department about DI training. Encourage strategies such as project based learning activities, grouping and pairing, ELL and ESE strategies.	Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-Hankerson Math department chair and grade level Administrators Math coach	Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessment to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit. Math Coach and Department Chair will be versed in classroom organization and classroom management. The on-site math coach will be in classrooms on a daily basis to support teachers with group activities and ESE and ELL strategies.	District BAT Data Analysis Teachers Made Tests. Monthly Assessment. Project Rubric.

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. Algebra Goal #3D:	65%(33) Students with Disabilities SWD will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(32) Students with Disabilities SWD not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	65%(33) Students with Disabilities SWD will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

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	Teachers lack use of Differentiated Instructional Strategies (DI).	Discussion within the mathematics department about DI training. Encourage strategies such as project based learning activities, grouping and pairing, ELL and ESE strategies.	Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-Hankerson Math department chair and grade level Administrators Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques	Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessment to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit. Math Coach and Department Chair will be versed in classroom organization and classroom management. The on-site math coach will be in classrooms on a daily basis to support teachers with group activities and ESE and ELL strategies.	District BAT Data Analysis Teachers Made Tests. Monthly Assessment. Project Rubric.

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. Algebra Goal #3E:	By June 2013, 40%(160)Economically Disadvantaged students will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 49%(180) Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	40%(160)Economically Disadvantaged students will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of Strategies and knowledge, foundations of basic mathematics skills	Pull-out session to reinforce strategies and develop critical thinking skills. Students will learn problem-solving strategies to assist with higher order thinking to help address benchmarks of NGSS, Common Core Standards and successfully passed EOC.	Mathematics teachers, ESE Support	Classroom walkthrough by Math Coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques Classroom walkthrough by Assistant principal, Robert Levinsky	Pre and Post-Test, Monthly Assessment, BAT Assessment.

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By June 2013, 50%(225)Students will be scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry End of The Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 33.3%(120) Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry End of the Course Exam.	50%(225)Students will be scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry End of The Course Exam.

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	Teachers lack of familiarity with new textbooks resource materials.	Teachers will identify common focus. Textbooks resource trainers will come to give professional development to the mathematics department of what resources available within the textbooks series. Teacher will discuss what resources they will use to improve learning and the teaching methodology. Implementation of the living curriculum and reflection of what is or not working. Analysis of curriculum and programs will be ongoing by administrators, coaches, and department chair to ensure appropriate instruction and adherence to curriculum map, created by the mathematics department or provided from the district.	Math curriculum coach, Grade level administrators	Classroom Walk Through (CWT) will be conducted weekly by Grade Level administrators, Math Coach, Department Chairs to focus on the usage of textbook resources. Data chats with the teachers will be conducted to discuss CWT results and a future plan of actions.	District BAT and bi-weekly benchmark assessments, Monthly End of Course (EOC) practice Assessment, and Content Area common assessment.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	By June 2013, 30%(135) students will be scoring a level 4 and 5 in Geometry End of the Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

June 2012, 23.3%(84)students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry			30%(135) students will be scoring a level 4 and 5 in Geometry End of the Course Exam.		
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	Teachers lack of familiarity on how to use a variety of manipulatives/organizers when teaching new concepts to support test taking strategies into the Next Generation of Sunshine State Standard.	Pretest will be given in September to Geometry students to assess readiness. Mathematics Department discussion on the result of the test and identify weakness. Math coach will provide Warm up questions to the teachers to drive the Geometry curriculum . Teachers will analyze the result to recommend the next action for each student (After school tutoring, Online course recommendation, Peer tutoring, ect...)	Administration Staff, Math Coach and Guidance Counselors.	Classroom Walk Through (CWT)once a week by Administrative Staff and Math Coach that will focus on Geometry Prep. questions strategies being implemented. Guidance Counselors discussing the result with students.	Biweekly Assessment Monthly Assessment SAT and ACT results. Teacher made quizzes and tests Lesson plans

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 # By June 2013, 60%(270) Students will be scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry End of the Course Exam. 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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. Geometry Goal #3B:	By June 2013, 35%(158)students subgroups Black will not be making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 46.8%(148) students subgroups Black not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	35%(158) will not be making satisfactory progress in Geometry End of the Course Exam.

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
	Teachers have difficulty infusing remedial math skills into mathematics	Mathematics teachers will be encouraged to register and attend the	Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-	Scheduling meetings at the beginning of both semesters to determine	Pretest and Posttest, Monthly Assessment

1	classes.	<p>Keys of Problem Solving Workshop. Teachers will return and share the strategies with the department. Teachers will implement strategies learned. All students scoring level 1 on the 2012 Algebra EOC will receive Mathematics instruction and /or remediation.</p> <p>All students in mathematics classes will engage daily academic strategies focusing on Algebra I and Geometry Benchmarks. Instruction will include strategies for responding to EOCs fill in response items.</p> <p>Mathematics teachers will utilize the Secondary Instructional Focus Calendar to provide daily review of Algebra I and Geometry benchmarks.</p>	<p>Hankerson</p> <p>Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques</p> <p>Assistant Principal, Robert Levinsky</p> <p>Mathematics teachers</p>	<p>proper placement of at-risk students.</p> <p>Observations of teachers and analysis of curriculum and programs will be on going by administrators, coaches and department chair to ensure appropriate instruction and adherence to curriculum map, created by the mathematics department or provided from the district.</p> <p>Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessments to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit.</p> <p>Math coach and District support Staff will provide in-service on classroom set up for effective mathematics instruction.</p>	<p>BAT EOCs data Analysis</p> <p>Teachers Made Tests.</p>
---	----------	---	---	---	---

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. Geometry Goal #3C:	By June 2013, a reduction from 5 to 3 students of English Language Learners ELL will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 45.5%(5) English Language Learners ELL not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Reduced this year from 5 to 3 students of English Language Learners ELL will not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

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	Teachers lack use of Differentiated Instructional Strategies (DI).	Discussion within the mathematics department about DI training. Encourage strategies such as project based learning activities, grouping and pairing, ELL and ESE strategies.	<p>Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-Hankerson</p> <p>Math department chair and grade level Administrators</p> <p>Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques</p>	<p>Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessment to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit.</p> <p>Math Coach and Department Chair will be versed in classroom organization and classroom management. The on-site math coach will be in classrooms on a daily basis to support teachers with group activities and ESE and</p>	<p>District BAT Data Analysis</p> <p>Teachers Made Tests.</p> <p>Monthly Assessment. Project Rubric.</p>

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	By June 2013, 50%(25) will not be making satisfactory progress in Geometry End of the Course Exam.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

June 2012, 68.2 %(15) Students subgroups SWD not making satisfactory progress in Geometry

50%(25) will not be making satisfactory progress in Geometry End of the Course Exam.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of interests to attend after school tutoring, Saturday EOC Prep. tutoring, and Math Pull-out.	All content area teachers will utilize departmental plan for incorporating mathematics in their curriculum area, when appropriate. Teachers encourage to give students incentives if the students attended afterschool program or Saturday EOCs Prep.	Math departments and grade level Administrators Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques	Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessment to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit.	Biweekly Assessment In House Monthly Assessment.

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:	By June 2013, 40%(160) students will not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

June 2012, 46.8%(148) Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

40%(160) students will not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

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
	Teachers have difficulty infusing remedial math skills into mathematics classes.	Mathematics teachers will be encouraged to register and attend the Keys of Problem Solving Workshop. Teachers will return and share the strategies with the department. Teachers will implement strategies learned. All students scoring level 1 on the 2012 Geometry EOC will receive	Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-Hankerson Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques Assistant Principal, Robert Levinsky	Scheduling meetings at the beginning of both semesters to determine proper placement of at-risk students. Observations of teachers and analysis of curriculum and programs will be on going by administrators, coaches and department chair to	Pretest and Posttest, Monthly Assessment BAT EOCs data Analysis Teachers Made Tests.

1		<p>Mathematics instruction and /or remediation.</p> <p>All students in mathematics classes will engage daily academic strategies focusing on Geometry Benchmarks. Instruction will include strategies for responding to EOCs fill in response items.</p> <p>Mathematics teachers will utilize the Secondary Instructional Focus Calendar to provide daily review of Geometry benchmarks.</p>	Mathematics teachers	<p>ensure appropriate instruction and adherence to curriculum map, created by the mathematics department or provided from the district.</p> <p>Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessments to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit.</p> <p>Math coach and District support Staff will provide in-service on classroom set up for effective mathematics instruction.</p>	
2	Teachers have difficulty infusing remedial math skills into mathematics classes.	<p>Mathematics teachers will be encouraged to register and attend the Keys of Problem Solving Workshop. Teachers will return and share the strategies with the department. Teachers will implement strategies learned. All students scoring level 1 on the 2012 Geometry EOC will receive Mathematics instruction and /or remediation.</p> <p>All students in mathematics classes will engage daily academic strategies focusing on Geometry Benchmarks. Instruction will include strategies for responding to EOCs fill in response items.</p> <p>Mathematics teachers will utilize the Secondary Instructional Focus Calendar to provide daily review of Geometry benchmarks.</p>	<p>Guidance director, Maryland Patterson-Hankerson</p> <p>Math coach, Pierre-Cesar Jean-Jacques</p> <p>Assistant Principal, Robert Levinsky</p> <p>Mathematics teachers</p>	<p>Scheduling meetings at the beginning of both semesters to determine proper placement of at-risk students.</p> <p>Observations of teachers and analysis of curriculum and programs will be on going by administrators, coaches and department chair to ensure appropriate instruction and adherence to curriculum map, created by the mathematics department or provided from the district.</p> <p>Math coach will work with teachers to analyze data from diagnostic assessments to ensure that interventions are targeted to area of deficit.</p> <p>Math coach and District support Staff will provide in-service on classroom set up for effective mathematics instruction.</p>	<p>Pretest and Posttest, Monthly Assessment</p> <p>BAT EOCs data Analysis</p> <p>Teachers Made Tests.</p>

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

Differentiated Instruction Training	Mathematics (6-12)	Math Coach	Math Teachers	Every Wednesday	Student Achievement Data	Grade Level Administrators
Homework Assistance	Grade 9-10/Mathematics	Mr. Jean-Jacques	School-wide	September 13-May20	Student Achievement Data	Mr. Walton, PIP Program Coordinator
Technology Through the Math Department	Grade 6-12, Mathematics	HRD	Mathematics Teacher	Once every quarter starting date September 8th, October 13th, December 7th, January 25th 2013.	Response to Instruction and Intervention	Grade Level Administrator
Training for teachers on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, Best Practices, and upcoming trends that affect Mathematics scores and Common Core Standards	Grade 6-12/ Mathematics	HRD	Mathematics Teachers	Ongoing	Classroom Walkthrough	Grade Level Administrator

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.

By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring at

Science Goal #1:	levels 4, 5, or 6 will be 30%(2)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 17% (1) of students scored at levels 4,5,or 6 on FAA science.	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring at levels 4,5,or 6 will be 30% (2)

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	Demonstrated deficits in reading comprehension affect skill acquisition	Students scoring at levels 1 or 2 on FAA science will use manipulatives to reinforce scientific concepts.	Department chair	monthly science assessment	FAA practice materials, teacher made/curriculum tests.

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	By June 2013, 100% (6) of the tested population will score at or above level 7 on FAA science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (5) of the tested population scored at or above level 7 on FAA science.	100% (6) of the tested population will score at or above 7 on FAA science.

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	Demonstrated reading comprehension deficits affect content area skill acquisition	Students scoring at or above level 7, will use manipulatives to reinforce scientific concepts.	Department chair	monthly science assessment	FAA practice materials, teacher made /curriculum tests.

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	By June 2013, the number of students achieving a proficiency level of 3 on the Biology EOC will increase by 20% (100).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 30% (130) of the students attained an	By June 2013, 50% (230) of the students will attain an

achievement level of 3 on the Biology EOC.			achievement level of 3 on the Biology 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	Student difficulty in concept retention over time.	Provide afterschool tutoring. Increase the use of Study Island in the classroom and at home. Daily review of concepts Comprehensive assessments Promote the use of USA Test Prep	Science Administrator	Mini-assessments Classroom visits Data chats Weekly Department Discussions	2013 Biology EOC results Mini-assessment data BAT data
2	Limited decoding and comprehension when reading scientific material.	Increased use of reading strategies (McRel and CRISS) will be incorporated into science lessons and activities. Participation in school-wide reading initiative	Science Administrator	Mini-assessments Classroom visits Data chats Weekly Department Discussions	2013 Biology EOC results Mini-assessment data BAT data
3	Lack of basic science concept knowledge/foundation	Teachers will use the Secondary Instructional Focus Calendar to teach/review basic science concepts	Science Administrator Science Department Chairperson	Mini-assessments Classroom visits Data chats Weekly Department Discussions	2013 Biology EOC results Mini-assessment data BAT data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	By June 2013, the number of students achieving a proficiency level 4 or 5 on the Biology EOC will increase by 8% (39).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 12% (53) of the students attained an achievement level of 4 or 5 on the Biology EOC.	By June 2013, 20% (92) of the students will attain an achievement level of 4 or 5 on the Biology 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	Student difficulty in utilizing higher order thinking process	Increase use of higher order thinking activities such as scientific research projects, problem-based learning activities and inquiry lab activities.	Science Administrator	Mini-assessments Classroom visits Data chats Weekly Department Discussions	2013 Biology EOC results Mini-assessment data BAT data

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
Biology PLC	Science	Biology Team Leader	All Biology Teachers	Ongoing – Weekly meetings - (August 2012 – May 2013)	Review PLC agenda Implementation should be evident during classroom visits	Science Department Chairperson
Common Core Standards PLC	Science	Science Department Chairperson	All Science Teachers	Ongoing – Monthly meetings - (August 2012 – May 2013)	Implementation should be evident during classroom visits Review student work samples	Science Department Chairperson

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.	By June of 2013; 92% (409 students) will score 3.0 or

Writing Goal #1a:	above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% (302) of the tested population met proficiency in writing by scoring level 3 or above on the 2012 administration of the FCAT.	92% (409) of the tested population will meet proficiency in writing by scoring level 4 or above on the 2013 administration of the FCAT.

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	Inconsistency in regard to analyzing the writing prompt and planning before composing the essay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer PD in regard to analyzing the writing prompt at the beginning of the year. • Teachers will follow the District IFC for Writing • Teachers' will model effective planning strategies with the students on a daily bases. • Writing Coach will meet with teachers to discuss effectiveness and to provide feedback weekly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Coach • Administrator responsible for the English Department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Walkthroughs • and weekly department meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and District Writing Assessments, • Informal Observational Checklist.
2	Students are inconsistent when elaborating in an essay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing offering English teachers weekly PD on elaboration • Teachers will model examples of effective elaboration techniques for students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Coach • Administrator responsible for the English Department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Walkthroughs and weekly department meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and District Assessments • Informal Observational Checklist
3	Lack of student motivation in regard to revising writing assignments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will conference with students weekly to inform students of their writing process. • Teachers will display a data wall as a method of keeping students informed of the students' individual and class writing process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department Chair, Instructional Coach and Administrative Staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Walkthroughs and weekly department meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal Observational Checklist, HRD Check List and IPAS Evaluation.
4	Inconsistent use of advanced vocabulary within the writing process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will attend PD on usage of advance vocabulary in writing September 2010. • Teachers will require students to include Tier II and Tier III words in writing assignments on a daily bases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department Chair, Instructional Coach and Administrative Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Walkthroughs and weekly department meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal Observational Checklist, HRD Check List and IPAS Evaluation.

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.	By June, 2013, 100% (7 students) of the tested population will score at 4 or higher in writing.
Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

86% (6 students) of the tested population scored at 4 or higher in writing.	87% (students) of the tested population will score at 4 or higher in writing.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Demonstrated lack of organizational & vocabulary skills hinders effective writing	Students will use word cards/sentence strips to develop sentences/simple paragraphs	Department chair	monthly writing prompt	FAA practice materials, supplied writing prompts

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
Conventions	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	Leader 9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Sept. 27, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader.
Elaboration	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Sept. 27, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader
Staff training: Holistic Scoring	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	September 13, 2012	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader, Ms. Smith, State Reading Coach.
Effective Expository Writing	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Oct. 4, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader.
Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Oct. 4, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader.

Planning for the FCAT Writing Essay	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Sept. 13, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader
The Art of Persuasive Writing	9th and 10th grade	T. Latimer, Teacher Leader	9th and 10th Grade English Teachers	Initial training on Sept. 27, 2012 with continuous support throughout the year.	One Student sample per block showing implementation and understanding of the topic. Implementations of strategy evident in CWT.	Mrs. Robinson, Principal; Mrs. Williams, Intern Principal; Mr. Levinsky, Assistant Principal; Mr. Walton, Assistant Principal; Ms. T. Latimer, teacher Leader.

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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 Attendance Goal #1:		By June 2013, the DHS Attendance rate will increase by 3%			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
90.5		93			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
667		550			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
500		300			
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 parental awareness on the importance of attendance.	. Parent links, guidance nights, letters home to parents, teacher phone contacts, parent conferences, and social worker referrals	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, technology specialist, guidance counselors, and social workers	Non-Attendance List, PLASCO generated reports, and guidance counselor chats	Parent Survey, PLASCO software, and Daily attendance Pinnacle report
2	Lack of student awareness on the importance of attendance.	Assemblies, orientation, small-group conferencing and mentoring	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, and social workers	One-to-one conferences, large and small group assemblies, state and district mandated attendance policies	Parent Survey, DMS/Teacher attendance referrals, and Daily attendance Pinnacle report

3	Lack of student motivation towards being on time and attending school regularly.	Mentoring, wake-up calls, parent conferences, and "SGA Incentives"	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, mentors/mentees, business partners, parent liaison, guidance counselors, and social workers	Observations Motivational classroom visitations	School-wide incentive monitoring template, student surveys, and student interviews
---	--	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	By June, 2013, Dillard High will reduce suspension rate by 10%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
4	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
4	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
46	40
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
43	40

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	Insufficient number of parent/teacher conferences	Parent Night focusing on discipline and resources available to parents. Increase the number of parent/teacher conferences.	Administrators	Follow up surveys Attendance sheets	DMS
2	Teachers not Implementing Discipline Plan	Discussion of discipline plan during team meetings with feedback from teachers and collaboration.	Administrators	Survey	DMS
3	Inconsistent Classroom Management	Trainings on effective discipline strategies and proper referral procedures.	Administrators	Classroom Observations	CHAMPs Rubric Basic 5

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	Dillard High will decrease the Dropout Rate by 0.5 and increase the NGA Graduation Rate by 6%
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
08-09: 1.3%	0.9%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

08-09: 83.7%			89.7%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have not attained the credits necessary for graduation. Also the students cannot retake or makeup classes that they have failed.	Credit Recovery (APEX) will be available to students who are not meeting credit requirements. Students will be career counseled with opportunities that will help them keep on the track of graduation.	Guidance Counselors and Administration Designee	Guidance and Guidance Administrator will disaggregate data about low level and under credit requirement students.	Mentoring Program and data pulled from teachers about their small groups
2	Students are not being informed of the graduation requirements.	Guidance interventions as noted through classroom visits, record evaluations and parent and student conferences.	Guidance Administrator, Carlos Flores Guidance Director, Maryland Hankerson	Evaluation of Guidance Conferencing Logs	Guidance Conferencing Logs
3	Lack of monitoring by guidance on the completion of graduation indicators.	Monthly meeting with principal and assistant principal on each junior and senior.	Guidance Administrator	Improvement of students meeting graduation status.	Graduation Matrix
4	Some students are just not attending school enough.	Full implementation of RtI Team. Daily progress reports and teacher referrals.	Behavioral Specialist Intervention Specialist Administrators	Weekly meetings with team and follow-up after initial referral.	RtI documentation Progress reports DMS

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:			In the 2011-2012 school-year, 40% of parents will attend events at Dillard High		
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
??% (??) of parents attended events at Dillard High in the 2010-2011 School Year			??% (??) of parents will attend events at Dillard High in the 2011-2012 school year		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	In PIP	In PIP	In PIP	In PIP	In PIP

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			Increase STEM literacy for all 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	Lack of STEM activities	Increase participation in science/STEM competitions Provide access to alternative STEM education through science field trips Increase participation in science-based clubs, programs and events.	Science Administrator Science Department Chairperson Science Competition Coordinator	Science-based club attendance data Science competition feedback	Science Competition Results

(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
STEM Grant Writing	Science	District STEM Team	All Science Teachers	October 2012	Science Competition Results	Science Department Chairperson Science Competition Coordinator

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				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based 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

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



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

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District DILLARD HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	33%	79%	91%	32%	235	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	55%	79%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	68% (YES)	73% (YES)			141	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					520	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District DILLARD HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	26%	74%	92%	27%	219	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	44%	81%			125	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	41% (NO)	75% (YES)			116	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					470	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested