



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

Clay High School  
2025 STATE HWY 16 W  
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043  
904-529-3000  
<http://chs.oneclay.net>

## School Demographics

**School Type**  
High School

**Title I**  
No

**Free and Reduced Lunch Rate**  
38%

**Alternative/ESE Center**  
No

**Charter School**  
No

**Minority Rate**  
22%

## School Grades History

**2013-14**  
B

**2012-13**  
A

**2011-12**  
A

**2010-11**  
A

## SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>28</b>

---

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

---

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

### Part I: Current School Status

---

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

### Part II: Expected Improvements

---

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

### Part III: Coordination and Integration

---

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

### Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

---

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

### Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

---

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

## Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

### DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

### DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

### DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

### 2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

  

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

Clay High School

##### Principal

Pete J McCabe

##### School Advisory Council chair

Toni Barrows

#### Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Cary Dicks	Vice Principal
Frances Celis	Assistant Principal
Tonya Srader	Reading/Intervention Coach
Linda Garcia	ESE/RTI Coordinator
Cheryl Nix	Guidance Department Head
Christy Fowler	Math
Justin Faulkner	English
Larry Milford	Social Studies
Stefanie Bergman	Science

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Clay

##### Superintendent

Mr. Charles E Vanzant, Jr

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

Pending

### School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### Membership of the SAC

Peter J. McCabe, Principal

Toni Barrows, SAC Chair

Cheryl Nix, Recording Secretary

#### Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Several members have canvassed faculty members by department to gain their input and determine realistic and achievable goals. The entire SAC will review the completed plan then vote to accept or amend the document.

### **Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

SAC is involved in conducting the CHS Parent Survey which is in addition to the District Parent Survey. Parents are surveyed at Devils' Bash and the Homecoming Football Game. The survey results are then compared with the previous years.

### **Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project**

Faculty members write a proposal to request funds to augment student needs in the classroom. The SAC reviews the proposal which is often presented by the teacher requesting funds. SAC votes to fund the proposal.

### **Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC**

Not In Compliance

### **If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements**

Clay High School is actively recruiting members for the SAC to become compliant.

## **Highly Qualified Staff**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### **Administrators**

#### **# of administrators**

4

#### **# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

#### **Administrator Information:**

#### **Pete J McCabe**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 35

Years at Current School: 36

#### **Credentials**

Bachelor of Science in Education

Masters of Science in Administrative Supervision

#### **Performance Record**

Clay High has risen from a "B" school in 2010 to an "A" school for 2011 and 2012. During that time, our percentage of students meeting high standards in Reading has risen from 51% proficiency to 58%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in Math has dropped from 80% to 71%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in writing dropped from 90% to 84% in 2011, but then returned to 90% in 2012.

Matt Lewis		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 6	Years at Current School: 18
Credentials	Bachelor of Science in American History Bachelor of Science in World History Bachelor of Science in Education Masters in Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	Clay High has risen from a “B” school in 2010 to an “A” school for 2011 and 2012. During that time, our percentage of students meeting high standards in Reading has risen from 51% proficiency to 58%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in Math has dropped from 80% to 71%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in writing dropped from 90% to 84% in 2011, but then returned to 90% in 2012.	
Cary Dicks		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 10	Years at Current School: 16
Credentials	Bachelor of Exercise and Sport Sciences Masters in Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	Clay High has risen from a “B” school in 2010 to an “A” school for 2011 and 2012. During that time, our percentage of students meeting high standards in Reading has risen from 51% proficiency to 58%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in Math has dropped from 80% to 71%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in writing dropped from 90% to 84% in 2011, but then returned to 90% in 2012.	
Frances Celis		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 1
Credentials	Bachelor of Science in Special Education Masters degree in School Counseling Specialist degree in Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	Lakeside Junior High School was the top performing school in the district for the last two years. The school maintained an "A" even when the grading system changed for the junior high level. Clay High has risen from a “B” school in 2010 to an “A” school for 2011 and 2012. During that time, our percentage of students meeting high standards in Reading has risen from 51% proficiency to 58%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in Math has dropped from 80% to 71%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in writing dropped from 90% to 84% in 2011, but then returned to 90% in 2012.	



**Instructional Coaches****# of instructional coaches**

1

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:****Tonya Srader**

Full-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 3

**Areas**

Reading/Literacy, RtI/MTSS

**Credentials**Bachelors in Secondary English Education  
Masters in Secondary ESE and Reading**Performance Record**

Clay High has risen from a "B" school in 2010 to an "A" school for 2011 and 2012. During that time, our percentage of students meeting high standards in Reading has risen from 51% proficiency to 58%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in Math has dropped from 80% to 71%. Our percentage of students meeting high standards in writing dropped from 90% to 84% in 2011, but then returned to 90% in 2012.

**Classroom Teachers****# of classroom teachers**

95

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

95, 100%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

100%

**# certified in-field**

94, 99%

**# ESOL endorsed**

9, 9%

**# reading endorsed**

10, 11%

**# with advanced degrees**

28, 29%

**# National Board Certified**

0, 0%

**# first-year teachers**

6, 6%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

15, 16%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

33, 35%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

41, 43%

**Education Paraprofessionals****# of paraprofessionals**

14

**# Highly Qualified**

14, 100%

**Other Instructional Personnel****# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

0

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible**

Clay High School seeks to only recruit and hire highly qualified candidates for available positions. Through means such as Clay County's Teacher Recruitment Fair and Online Portal, Mr. McCabe and the administrative staff interview and select only those of the highest caliber for teaching positions available. Through continuous professional development and staff training, Clay High School is able to maintain a low level of attrition and retain a highly-qualified teaching staff.

**Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities**

Mr. McCabe selects qualified teachers to mentor new teachers going through certification programs. Mentors are also chosen for any new teacher, no matter the level of experience, to assist in the acclimation into Clay High School and the district. Teachers are paired according to department level if possible otherwise schedules, interests, etc. are taken into consideration for selection. Mentor teachers coordinate with each other to devise a unified plan to implement with new teachers and that plan is communicated with each respective new teacher. Each mentor relationship will consist of conference meetings, classroom observations, and strategic lesson planning to ensure student achievement remains as the top priority.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs**

All K-10 and level 1 & 2 11th and 12th grade students will take a benchmark assessment 3 times per year. School-based leadership teams will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. Coaches are in place at each school and will focus upon supporting quality Tier 1 instruction in all content areas. Administrators will meet monthly with all grade level/content area teams. At these monthly meetings, administrators and teachers will look at specific student data and will initiate Tier 2 or Tier 3 plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level / course expectations. These monthly meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

**Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP**

The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-2 FAIR, 3-12 Performance Matters benchmark assessments, and formal assessments such as FCAT 2.0 and high school EOCs. The principal is the leader of the meeting. Assistant principals attend the meetings in a support role for the principal. The reading/intervention coach serves to suggest effective interventions for Tier 1 instructional needs. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/content area grouping.

**Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP**

All students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions are tracked with the Performance Matters MTSS tracking system. Training on this tracking system took place in August, 2013. To assist administrators in identifying which students should be receiving interventions, administrators are able to pull a report from FOCUS that will indicate which students are receiving each tier of interventions, along with a date to reassess student performance. Students listed on the FOCUS reports will be addressed at the monthly intervention meetings. At this time, the teachers and administrators – as an intervention team – will make the decision as to continue interventions at the current level, change or intensify interventions, or discontinue the intervention.

**Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement**

Core reading instruction is analyzed at the K-2 level using FAIR. Data is accessed through the PMRN and also within the Performance Matters data warehouse. In grades 3-10 (and level 1 & 2 11th and 12th grade), core reading and math instruction is analyzed using benchmark assessments within the Performance Matters system. Supplemental and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science and writing are analyzed using in-program assessments, progress monitoring assessments available through Performance Matters, District-supplied assessments, and through teacher-selected progress monitoring assessments. District specialists and reading/intervention coaches provided engagement strategy training during pre-planning of the 2013 school year and will continue to provide support in this area throughout the year.

**Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents**

Meetings have been scheduled with school administrators and district staff (October, January & May) to discuss MTSS implementation. Meetings with Intervention Team Facilitators will meet in August, January and May to discuss and clarify procedures for documenting MTSS plans for students. A brochure explaining MTSS has been updated and posted on the district website. Copies of this brochure are available to hand to parents during conferences.

### Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:**

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 3,600

Students are offered tutoring Monday through Thursday each week in each content area. Boot camp sessions are offered in each content area two weeks prior to assessment.

#### Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

#### How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

The SBLT monitors student grades, Performance Matters Benchmarks, and State assessment results. Sign-in logs are also compiled for each tutoring session and Boot Camp to track further data.

#### Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

SBLT

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

#### Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Peter McCabe	Principal
Cary Dicks	Vice Principal
Frances Celis	Assistant Principal
Matt Lewis	Assistant Principal
Tonya Srader	Reading / Intervention Coach
Linda Garcia	ESE / RTI Coordinator
Cheryl Nix	Guidance Department Chair
Christy Fowler	Math
Justin Faulkner	Language Arts

Name	Title
Larry Milford	Social Studies
Stefanie Bergman	Science

### **How the school-based LLT functions**

The LLT will meet once a month on Mondays to review data provided by the SBRtI Team to determine faculty training needs on delivery of Tier 1 interventions, implementation, if needed, of Tier 2 intervention, and integrating all three tiers in a class period. Our focus this year is improving the learning gains of our lower 25% population in Math and Reading.

### **Major initiatives of the LLT**

We will focus on students who have not passed the Florida Comprehensive Assessment test (FCAT) in Reading; Reading and Math FCAT retakers and EOC Algebra 1 retakers. We will also look at behavior, attendance and grades on these same students who are being monitored through our mentoring program.

## **Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction**

### **How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student**

Teachers across the curriculum will engage in reading strategies in their classrooms. Each day, every teacher will facilitate and participate in organized Silent Sustained Reading. Also, teachers are becoming certified in Next Generation Content Area Reading Professional Development (NG CAR-PD) throughout each content area in the school. Finally, there is a school-wide initiative on the focus of engagement strategies to increase proficiency in reading and writing in all content areas.

## **College and Career Readiness**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### **How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future**

In all of our other CTE classes we integrate academic subjects as often as possible so the students see that what they are learning is used in everyday life. For example, in the Criminal Justice program, we show the students the relevance of Math in crime scene measuring, traffic crash investigation, etc. We show the relevance of English in report writing and creating an investigative file that is used in testifying in court, etc. Science is used from the deputy on the street to the forensic investigator. Analyzing blood, drugs, etc. Social Studies we learn why crime happens, look at cases where case laws were created, for example Miranda v Arizona which created the constitutional warnings (Miranda Warnings) etc.

### **How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful**

The students enrolled in a CTE class or an academy are exposed to the many areas through the Career Shadowing Program and field trips throughout the school year. Students are tracked by the Career Specialist if they are enrolled in any CTE pathway (Academy or class). Our Career Specialist and Guidance team meet with each student one-on-one and lay out a plan of study for each student's 4 years of high school. We also visit with each CTE class throughout the year and complete mini lessons on career areas within each pathway. Additional information is always available in the guidance offices.

### **Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level**

Teaching the skills that are relevant to the career field help prepare the student to succeed at the postsecondary level by stressing the importance of academic courses to the career field. Knowing why you are taking English, Math, Science, and Social Studies, brings a whole new meaning to why you sit in class.

## Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Area 1: Reading

**Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	66%	66%	Yes	69%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%	48%	Yes	54%
Hispanic	63%	63%	Yes	67%
White	68%	68%	Yes	71%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	43%	43%	Yes	49%
Economically disadvantaged	50%	50%	Yes	55%

### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	174	26%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	210	32%	35%

### Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		23%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	11	61%	65%

### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	381	53%	58%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	62	73%	78%

**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	21	40%	45%

**Area 2: Writing**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	203	56%	61%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	11	85%	88%

**Area 3: Mathematics****High School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	58%	58%	Yes	63%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	51%	51%	Yes	56%
Hispanic	49%	49%	Yes	54%
White	59%	59%	Yes	63%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	46%	46%	Yes	51%
Economically disadvantaged	54%	54%	Yes	59%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		38%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		49%



**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	32	19%	24%

**Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	256	71%	75%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	67	19%	24%

**Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	125	37%	42%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	116	34%	39%

**Area 4: Science****Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	130	38%	43%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	91	27%	32%

**Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	994	72%	77%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	745	54%	60%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		75%	78%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	212	15%	20%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		92%	96%
CTE program concentrators	712	52%	57%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	8	8%	13%

**Area 8: Early Warning Systems**

**High School Indicators**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	394	28%	24%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	159	42%	38%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students with grade point average less than 2.0			
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	0	0%	0%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

**Graduation**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.			
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)			
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.		68%	86%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)		65%	70%

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.
- G2.** Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.
- G3.** Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.

## Goals Detail

### G1. Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.

#### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, Postsecondary Readiness)

#### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Reading Coach
- Common Planning
- Benchmark assessment software

#### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teacher knowledge

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Reading comprehension and critical thinking

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Content Area Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule:

Quarterly

#### Evidence of Completion:

Performance Matters Assessment, FCAT 2.0

## **G2. Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.**

### **Targets Supported**

- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC

### **Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Common Planning
- District Level Common Core Resource Meetings

### **Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Teacher knowledge

## **Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Math proficiency

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Teachers

### **Target Dates or Schedule:**

Quarterly

### **Evidence of Completion:**

Performance Matters Assessments, EOC's, PERT

## **G3. Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.**

### **Targets Supported**

- Writing

### **Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Common Planning
- PLCs based Content Area focusing on "Writing Strategies"

### **Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Teacher knowledge

## **Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Student writing

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Content Area Teachers

### **Target Dates or Schedule:**

Quarterly

### **Evidence of Completion:**

Clay Writes, FCAT Writes, DBQ's

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.

**G1.B1** Teacher knowledge

**G1.B1.S1** Organize the faculty by departments into PLC's for the school year.

#### Action Step 1

Design PLC sessions focused on reading strategies.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Frances Celis, Tonya Srader, Department Chairs

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Second week of October

#### Evidence of Completion

PLC Outlines

#### Facilitator:

Frances Celis, Tonya Srader

#### Participants:

Content Area Teachers

#### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

PLC's

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Content Area Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Once Monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

Sign-in Sheets, PLC logs, Navigator Plus

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Classroom observations/walk-throughs

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

### Evidence of Completion

Strategies in practice, lesson plans, PD360 templates

## G2. Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.

### G2.B1 Teacher knowledge

#### G2.B1.S1 Organize the math department by subject area into PLC's for the school year.

### Action Step 1

Design PLC sessions focused on Math strategies.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Clay Richardson (Geometry), Christy Fowler (Algebra I), Catherine Porter (Algebra II)

### Target Dates or Schedule

Second week of October

### Evidence of Completion

PLC Outlines, PLC logs, Navigator Plus

### Facilitator:

Richardson, Fowler, Porter

### Participants:

Math Teachers

## Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

PLC's

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Teachers

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Once Monthly

### **Evidence of Completion**

Sign-in Sheets

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Classroom observations/walk-throughs

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Monthly

### **Evidence of Completion**

Strategies in practice, lesson plans, PD360 templates

**G3.** Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.

**G3.B1** Teacher knowledge

**G3.B1.S1** Organize faculty by Departments into PLCs for the school year.

**Action Step 1**

Design PLC sessions focused on writing strategies.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Frances Celis

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Second week of October

**Evidence of Completion**

PLC Outlines, PLC logs, Navigator Plus

**Facilitator:**

Frances Celis

**Participants:**

Content Area Teachers

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1**

PLC's

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Content Area Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Once Monthly

**Evidence of Completion**

Sign-in Sheets



## **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1**

Classroom observations/walk-throughs

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Monthly

### **Evidence of Completion**

Strategies in practice, lesson plans, PD360 templates

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

*Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.*

### G1. Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.

#### G1.B1 Teacher knowledge

##### G1.B1.S1 Organize the faculty by departments into PLC's for the school year.

#### PD Opportunity 1

Design PLC sessions focused on reading strategies.

#### Facilitator

Frances Celis, Tonya Srader

#### Participants

Content Area Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Second week of October

#### Evidence of Completion

PLC Outlines

**G2. Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.**

**G2.B1 Teacher knowledge**

**G2.B1.S1 Organize the math department by subject area into PLC's for the school year.**

**PD Opportunity 1**

Design PLC sessions focused on Math strategies.

**Facilitator**

Richardson, Fowler, Porter

**Participants**

Math Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Second week of October

**Evidence of Completion**

PLC Outlines, PLC logs, Navigator Plus

**G3. Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.**

**G3.B1 Teacher knowledge**

**G3.B1.S1 Organize faculty by Departments into PLCs for the school year.**

**PD Opportunity 1**

Design PLC sessions focused on writing strategies.

**Facilitator**

Frances Celis

**Participants**

Content Area Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Second week of October

**Evidence of Completion**

PLC Outlines, PLC logs, Navigator Plus

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.	\$2,000
G2.	Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.	\$2,000
G3.	Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.	\$2,000
Total		\$6,000

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Evidence-Based Materials	Total
School Improvement	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000
Total	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000

### Budget Details

*Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.*

#### G1. Increase students' critical thinking and reading comprehension skills in reading.

##### G1.B1 Teacher knowledge

##### G1.B1.S1 Organize the faculty by departments into PLC's for the school year.

#### Action Step 1

Design PLC sessions focused on reading strategies.

#### Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

#### Resource

Print materials, workshops, training resources

#### Funding Source

School Improvement

#### Amount Needed

\$2,000

**G2. Increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills in mathematics.**

**G2.B1 Teacher knowledge**

**G2.B1.S1 Organize the math department by subject area into PLC's for the school year.**

**Action Step 1**

Design PLC sessions focused on Math strategies.

**Resource Type**

Evidence-Based Materials

**Resource**

Print materials, workshops, training resources

**Funding Source**

School Improvement

**Amount Needed**

\$2,000

**G3. Increase students' critical thinking skills through incorporating writing strategies throughout all content areas.**

**G3.B1 Teacher knowledge**

**G3.B1.S1 Organize faculty by Departments into PLCs for the school year.**

**Action Step 1**

Design PLC sessions focused on writing strategies.

**Resource Type**

Evidence-Based Program

**Resource**

Print materials, workshops, training resources

**Funding Source**

School Improvement

**Amount Needed**

\$2,000