



**Pam Stewart, Commissioner**

## **2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

---

---

**Boca Raton Community High School**

1501 NW 15TH CT

Boca Raton, FL 33486

561-338-1400

[www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/bocaratonhs](http://www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/bocaratonhs)

---

## School Demographics

---

<b>School Type</b> High School	<b>Title I</b> No	<b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b> 38%
<b>Alternative/ESE Center</b> No	<b>Charter School</b> No	<b>Minority Rate</b> 40%

---

## School Grades History

---

<b>2013-14</b> A	<b>2012-13</b> A	<b>2011-12</b> A	<b>2010-11</b> 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>16</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>29</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**

Boca Raton Community High School

**Principal**

Geoff Mckee

**School Advisory Council chair**

Joshua Prieur/Pam Paschke

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

Name	Title
Jean Wasko	Assistant Principal
John Michaels	Assistant Principal
Susie King	Assistant Principal
Evan Wasserman	Assistant Principal
Robert Berthiaume	Assistant Principal

#### District-Level Information

**District**

Palm Beach

**Superintendent**

Mr. E. Wayne Gent

**Date of school board approval of SIP**

11/19/2013

### 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

SAC's job is to examine aspects of its school as suggested by the priorities and generate a School Improvement Plan (SIP) that addresses targeting the identified priorities and meeting the student performance standards.

The Chairperson is Pam Pashke and Co-Chair is Joshua Prieur.

The Secretary is Madison Maher.

The following are current members for the academic year 2013-14

Paige Barbagallo, Sami Becherer, Jane Homrich, Taylor Hupp, Madison Maher, Troy Nishizaki, Kelsey Powers, Gia Prelli, Lily Putra, Taylor Shickles, Jessica Speer, Guller Tukel, Eric Applewhite, Leslie Jackson, Caroline Kasper, Janet little, Chris Maccari, Malinka Nyitray, Mary Powers, Lidia Rodriguez-Hupp, Ann Shauer, Michelle Shickles, Julia Sibner, Robbye Soler, Nancy Trowbridge-Kitchens, Allison Bradley, Ryan Coram, Marisa Flint, Meghan Forbush, Darrell Fraley, Wilnic Gideon, Melvin Hernandez, Catherine Husk, Geoff McKee, Tiffany O'Bryan, Rosanne Oliveiro, Rochelle Rolle, Katherine Runkle, Nicole Synkowicz.

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

The SAC oversees and approves the SIP in a number of ways. All members are encouraged to participate in the process. At the start of the school year during the first or second SAC meeting the members are provided with information about the SIP and its contents and provided with the necessary information to view the SIP. At these meetings, they are also made aware that the SIP is a living document and modifications are permitted through the year.

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

The initial SAC meeting was held on September 16th. The process of selecting members and the executive was begun and two co-chairs were chosen. The bylaws were approved at the October 14 meeting.

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

School Improvement funds will be used to support goals outlined in the SIP. A budget committee will address requests for allocations during the year and make recommendations to the SAC as a whole as to their support or lack of support for each request.

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

In Compliance

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

**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**

5

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

**Geoff Mckee**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 29

Years at Current School: 10

**Credentials**

Phd in Educational Leadership  
Florida Certified in K-12 Educational Leadership, Middle Grades Math, Elementary Math.

**Performance Record**

For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.

<b>John Michaels</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 9
<b>Credentials</b>	Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education Masters in Secondary Education Master in Educational Leadership	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.	

<b>Robert Berthiaume</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 11	Years at Current School: 14
<b>Credentials</b>	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology Honors Bachelor of Commerce Bachelor of Arts in Education Juris Doctor	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.	

<b>Jean Wasko</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 13	Years at Current School: 28
<b>Credentials</b>	Bachelor of Arts in English Masters in Education Masters in Educational Supervision	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.	

<b>Evan Wasserman</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 2	Years at Current School: 8
<b>Credentials</b>	Bachelor of Arts Masters in Educational Leadership	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.	

<b>Susie King</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 10	Years at Current School: 10
<b>Credentials</b>	Doctorate in Education Masters in Education Bachelor of Science in Mathematics	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not. For Math in the 2013 school year, the overall student population and all subgroups met the AMO for the year. The graduation rate rose from 86% to 90%. The percentage of students scoring at a satisfactory rate rose from 89% to 93%.	

**Instructional Coaches**

<b># of instructional coaches</b>	1
<b># receiving effective rating or higher</b> (not entered because basis is < 10)	
<b>Instructional Coach Information:</b>	

<b>Ilene Cahan</b>		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 4	Years at Current School: 4
<b>Areas</b>	[none selected]	
<b>Credentials</b>	Master of Science, Certified in English, Reading and Special Education, Bachelor of Science	
<b>Performance Record</b>	For Reading in the 2013 school year, the overall student population met the AMO, but the American Indian subgroup, and the Students With Disabilities subgroup did not.	

### Classroom Teachers

**# of classroom teachers**

173

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

173, 100%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

95%

**# certified in-field**

157, 91%

**# ESOL endorsed**

59, 34%

**# reading endorsed**

29, 17%

**# with advanced degrees**

71, 41%

**# National Board Certified**

13, 8%

**# first-year teachers**

13, 8%

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

63, 36%

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

35, 20%

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

62, 36%

### Education Paraprofessionals

**# of paraprofessionals**

2

**# Highly Qualified**

2, 100%

### Other Instructional Personnel

**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

0

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 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**

Administrative staff attend jobs fairs and keep in close contact with two nearby universities. Education students from the two universities frequently do their student teaching at the school, giving both sides an opportunity to evaluate whether they are a good fit for the school. Several staff members work as adjunct professors at schools of education, giving us access to those students as well.

### **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**

Teachers new to the profession are assigned a mentor and a buddy. The mentor is ClinEd certified and is in the same subject area and the buddy is a veteran in a nearby classroom. Veteran teachers new to the school are paired with a buddy. There is an initial orientation meeting where the new teachers meet the administrators, mentors and buddies. Through the year the BTAP team (Beginning Teachers Activity Team) provides professional development workshops. New teachers work towards accomplishing the Florida Accomplished Educator Practices.

### **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**

The tiered model of reading and writing instruction at Boca High includes three levels. At tier one, core, we offer on grade-level, honors, AP, and AICE courses. At tier two (supplemental), students who score a level two on the FCAT are placed in an intensive reading course which involves an extra hour of reading instruction and generally has a lower student to teacher ratio than tier one courses. At tier three (intensive), students who score a level one on the FCAT are placed in an intensive reading and intensive language arts class which involves two extra hours of reading instruction and generally has an even lower student to teacher ratio than tier two.

Every Friday morning the School Based Team meets to discuss the progress of students at each tier and brainstorm additional interventions if necessary to help students reach grade level standards. The SwPBS team meets monthly to discuss behavioral issues at each tier and brainstorm ideas to prevent these issues from continuing to grow.

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

The SBT and SwPBS team consists of teachers, counselors, administrators, the reading coach, school nurse, ESE and ESOL coordinators that are committed to creating a safe and professional learning environment. This is accomplished through clearly defined learning goals and behavioral expectations. Learning objectives and classroom rules, including consequences that are specific to each teacher and subject, are posted in the classroom. School-wide expectations are modeled by students, faculty, and administration and consistent consequences are outlined in the school matrix. Students identified to be at risk of not achieving learning outcomes or to be of behavioral concern are considered for additional evidence based interventions, often found on the district MTSS website, chosen by all relevant members of the team. These students are identified by practice tests given in class, diagnostic testing, FCAT, as

well as, number and type of behavior referrals received as reported by the classroom teacher, counselor or dean.

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

The administration and classroom teachers monitor fidelity at each level. This is done through diagnostic testing and assessments given within the individual courses. Additionally, School Based Team monitors the fidelity at the supplemental and intensive levels by assigning each student a case liaison who is responsible for updating the team on the progress of their students. The case liaison monitors the intervention(s) in place to check that they are being performed effectively and as planned. EDW is used to track the students' yearly progress to identify them as being behind, on, or above grade level expectations and to notice past trends in achievement. Mainframe is used to track discipline and attendance records to spot areas for improvement.

### **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**

EDW is used to track the students' yearly progress to identify them as being behind, on, or above grade level expectations and to notice past trends in achievement. It is also used to track discipline and attendance records to spot areas for improvement. Classroom walkthroughs are performed by Assistant Principals to help monitor the effectiveness of instruction in meeting learning objectives. Daily walkthroughs are performed by the principal to monitor student engagement and effective teaching practices, including bell to bell instruction and scaffolding. The FCAT and previous year's grades are used for planning course placement.

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

5. During pre-school, LTM, and department meetings faculty and staff are presented with effective and ineffective strategies, data discussions and professional development opportunities. Parents are communicated with through open house, Edline blasts, SAC meetings and parent conferences. MTSS is directly discussed with the parents when their child is entered into SBT either by the SBT leader or the case liaison.

### **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:**

The National Honor Society provides tutoring for students in math on a once a week basis. Teaching teams made up of teachers who have a common teaching course meet on a regular basis to develop and analyze assessments and teaching practices. Prep Programs are offered for students on weekends and during school days for AP exams, AICE exams, SAT, PSAT and ACT exams. There is a College Boot Camp offered during the summer to prepare students for the college application process and to answer questions about college admission and general life.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

Results of standardized tests in each area they are offered (AP, AICE, SAT, ACT, etc) are analyzed to determine the effect of the preparation process. College admission statistics are analyzed to determine the effect of the

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

All administrative, educational and counselling staff participate in the analysis of results of the training and prep activities.

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

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

Name	Title
Ilene Cahan	Reading Coach
Stacy Layton	Grade 9 Intensive Reading Teacher
Donna Capparelli	Grade 10 Intensive Reading Teacher
Sarah Call	Grade 9 English Teacher
Christine Peterson	Grade 10 English Teacher
Rita Ortiz	Grade 11/12 Reading Retake Teacher
Jean Wasko	Assistant Principal for English and Reading
Geoff Mckee	Principal

**How the school-based LLT functions**

1. All teachers are required to participate in Learning Team meetings that include common planning and analysis of common assessments that include the Reading benchmarks. Teachers collaborate to develop questions that match the FCAT 2.0 and the CCSS. Administrators monitor this implementation by department. Also, the school has a Reading Coach who participates in weekly Learning Team meetings with English, Reading and World History teams. During these meetings, the reading coach provides guidance on teaching to the benchmarks and utilizing research based teaching strategies. The reading coach also works with teachers and students individually, or in small groups. Furthermore, formal Professional Development is encouraged at the school site, or at off campus locations. This year

we are bringing in District specialists to train our teachers on how to use writing when developing reading assessments. Also, several teachers attended off campus training for implementing the Common Core Reading Standards. In addition, many teachers are participating in the District online Reading Endorsement classes.

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

The Reading Leadership Team meets monthly at 10:30 am on the District LTM days with the purpose to discuss reading and writing initiatives as well as analyzing test data, such as the District Diagnostic reports. The major area of focus this year is implementing the Common Core Standards and connecting reading and writing to prepare teachers and students for the Common Core Standards assessment in 2015.

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

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

All teachers are required to participate in Learning Team meetings that include common planning and analysis of common assessments that include the Reading Benchmarks. Teachers collaborate to develop questions that match the FCAT 2.0 and the CCSS. Administrators monitor this implementation by department. Also, the school has a Reading Coach who participates in weekly Learning Team meetings with English, Reading, and World History teams. During these meetings, the reading coach provides guidance on teaching to the benchmarks and utilizing research based teaching strategies. The reading coach also works with teachers and students individually, or in small groups. Furthermore, formal Professional Development is encouraged at the campus site or at off campus locations. This year we are bringing in our District specialists to train our teachers on how to use writing when developing reading assessments. Also, several teachers attended off campus training for implementing the Common Core Reading Standards. In addition, many teachers are participating in the District online Reading Endorsement classes.

## **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**

The Health Sciences program introduces students to the real world practice of medicine. Students prepare by taking science and health related classes initially, then move into actual work in medical settings such as a pharmacy or hospital while taking concurrent support classes. The Early Childhood program provides students with the background knowledge needed to work in the field. Student progress to working with children as part of the program. The DCT and Internship programs provide support classes for students who also earn credits as they enter the workplace setting.

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

Each year administrative staff meet with every student in their English class to review the course selection sheet and the course selection process. Administrative staff are available throughout the summer for meetings with students and families to discuss course selections.

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

All students who are not college ready as determined by testing indicators take the PERT test. College prep activities are conducted in upper level classes as warmup activities. Dual enrollment courses

offered at Florida Atlantic University and Palm Beach State College are available to students. Summer College Boot Camps are offered to rising Senior students to prepare them for the college application process.

## 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	83%	79%	No	84%
American Indian	79%	62%	No	81%
Asian	91%	85%	No	92%
Black/African American	55%	52%	No	60%
Hispanic	79%	72%	No	81%
White	88%	86%	No	89%
English language learners	49%	44%	No	54%
Students with disabilities	61%	49%	No	65%
Economically disadvantaged	67%	68%	Yes	70%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	464	26%	28%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	772	44%	47%

#### 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>		45%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		40%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	1092	81%	85%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	230	83%	87%

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	66	51%	54%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	49	37%	39%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	42	32%	34%

**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.	489	70%	73%

**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	645	94%	95%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	11	85%	89%

**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	73%	86%	Yes	76%
American Indian				
Asian	93%	89%	No	94%
Black/African American	63%	68%	Yes	67%
Hispanic	68%	83%	Yes	72%
White	78%	91%	Yes	81%
English language learners	61%	67%	Yes	65%
Students with disabilities	58%	62%	Yes	62%
Economically disadvantaged	68%	80%	Yes	71%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	12	57%	60%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		20%

**Learning Gains**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)	870	83%	87%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)	90	79%	83%

**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.	568	72%	76%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	368	56%	61%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	170	26%	27%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	170	29%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	329	56%	59%

**Area 4: Science**

**High School Science**

**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>		60%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		30%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	220	34%	36%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	330	51%	54%

**Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**

**High Schools**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	649	22%	23%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		99%	99%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	422	65%	68%
<b>CTE-STEM program concentrators</b>			
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	18		20%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		100%	100%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	582	20%	26%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	777	82%	85%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	68	12%	20%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		60%	75%
<b>CTE program concentrators</b>			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

**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	29	1%	0%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	85	12%	11%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	61	9%	8%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	147	5%	4%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	14	2%	1%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	509	18%	17%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	96	3%	3%

### Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	42	1%	1%
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)	622	89%	91%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	42	76%	78%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	626	89%	90%

### Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### Parental involvement targets for the school

Parent involvement is an important factor in the success of our school on many levels. During the 2012-13 school year the parents volunteered for 11,053 hours at the school. This year we hope to increase the hours worked to 11,500 by increasing the number of volunteers and reaching out to get them involved in more activities.

#### Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Volunteer hours will increase to 11,500.	n/a	n/a%	n/a%

### Area 10: Additional Targets

**Additional targets for the school**

Boca Raton High School will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B Policy 2.09 (8)(b), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

History of Africans and African Americans

Hispanic Contributions

Women's Contributions

Sacrifices of Veterans

**Specific Additional Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Boca Raton Community High School teachers will infuse content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy (8)(b).	2893	100%	100%

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level Three on the Reading portion of the FCAT to 28% and the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or above to 48%.
- G2.** The percentage of students achieving a Level Three or above on the Algebra EOC will increase to 86%.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level Three on the Reading portion of the FCAT to 28% and the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or above to 48%.

### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0)

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- We have a dedicated Reading coach who trains Honors and Aice English and Advanced Reading teachers on Effective FCAT 2.0 strategies and resources through BAT team (learning team) meetings. Common Assessments and District Diagnostic assessments are used to determine the effectiveness of the training. A school wide research based test taking strategy (Search and Destroy) is used across English, World History and 9th and 10th grade elective classes.

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Time constraints placed on teachers by the nature of the AICE program and its curriculum requirements often impinge on the time dedicated to FCAT improvement.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

FCAT improvement

#### Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers and administrators

#### Target Dates or Schedule:

During analysis of diagnostic data

#### Evidence of Completion:

Diagnostic data reports from EDW.

**G2.** The percentage of students achieving a Level Three or above on the Algebra EOC will increase to 86%.

### **Targets Supported**

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

- Students who have scored level 1 or 2 from 8th grade Math FCAT are scheduled into Liberal Arts 1 to provide support for their algebra 1 class.
- Students who are not successful during semester 1 in algebra 1 are rescheduled into a block of sem 1 and sem 2 algebra 1 during sem 2.
- The ALEKS computer program is purchased for students who are in the Liberal Arts 1 and are not in an algebra class as well as our ESE algebra students and ELL algebra students at the request of the teacher.
- EOC Calculators are purchased for any student who cannot purchase one.
- The district support materials on Learning Village are implemented by the Algebra teachers.
- Algebra teachers work together in BAT teams to collaborate on best teaching practices, analysis student performance and create common assessments.

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

- Providing enough computer time during semester two when the bulk of testing takes up the use of the computers.

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

number of computers in library

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Testing coordinator

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

October 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion:**

number of computers in library.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level Three on the Reading portion of the FCAT to 28% and the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or above to 48%.

**G1.B1** Time constraints placed on teachers by the nature of the AICE program and its curriculum requirements often impinge on the time dedicated to FCAT improvement.

**G1.B1.S1** Teachers will focus on better combining the curriculum required by the AICE curriculum with FCAT type skills.

#### Action Step 1

Identify specific FCAT strategies that can be applied to AICE curriculum topics.

##### Person or Persons Responsible

AICE English teachers

##### Target Dates or Schedule

Learning team meetings

##### Evidence of Completion

Meeting minutes

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

Integration of FCAT skills and AICE curriculum

##### Person or Persons Responsible

AICE Co-ordinator, Reading Coach and Assistant Principal

##### Target Dates or Schedule

Bimonthly meetings

##### Evidence of Completion

Minutes of meetings and testing data

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

Strategies to be determined

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Assistant Principals

#### Target Dates or Schedule

during walkthroughs, informal observations, formal observations,

#### Evidence of Completion

IObservation forms.

**G2.** The percentage of students achieving a Level Three or above on the Algebra EOC will increase to 86%.

**G2.B2** Providing enough computer time during semester two when the bulk of testing takes up the use of the computers.

**G2.B2.S1** The number of computer stations available in the library will be increased during testing to make more computers available in other locations around the school.

#### Action Step 1

Increase the number of computers available during testing in the library

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Technical staff, testing co-ordinator

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Beginning in October

#### Evidence of Completion

Number of computers.

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

Increase in computers in the library

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Technical staff, testing coordinator

#### Target Dates or Schedule

October, 2013

#### Evidence of Completion

number of computers

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

Are computers in locations other than the library freed up during testing

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math teaching staff

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

During diagnostic and EOC testing in December 2013.

### **Evidence of Completion**

Teacher anecdotal reports.

## Coordination and Integration

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

### How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success, following our Behavioral Matrix, and teacher expected behaviors, communicating with parents and monitoring SwPBS. We update our action plans during Learning Team Meetings. We instill an appreciation for multicultural diversity through our antibullying campaign, structured lessons, and implementation of SwPBS programs.

## 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.*

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals