



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Atlantic High School
1250 REED CANAL RD
Port Orange, FL 32129
386-322-5600
<http://www.atlanticsharks.com/>

School Demographics

School Type
High School

Title I
No

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
58%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
No

Minority Rate
32%

School Grades History

2013-14
B

2012-13
B

2011-12
D

2010-11
D

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	19
Goals Summary	25
Goals Detail	25
Action Plan for Improvement	26
Part III: Coordination and Integration	30
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	31
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	32

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

Atlantic High School

Principal

Teresa Marcks

School Advisory Council chair

Jim Clements

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

Name	Title
Paul Nehrig	Assistant Principal, Curriculum
Brian Zinck	Assistant Principal, Data
Efrain Alejandro	Assistant Principal, ESE
LaTonya Elmore	Assistant Principal, Student Services
Veronica Garrett	Reading Coach
Danielle Leffler	Math Coach
Melanie Dabbe	Academic Coach
Dawn Alves	Science Coach

District-Level Information

District

Volusia

Superintendent

Dr. Margaret A Smith

Date of school board approval of SIP

12/10/2013

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

The AHS School Advisory Council consists of 17 members, representing parents, teachers, students, school support staff, administration, and the community. The membership represents the diverse ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. The SAC Chairperson is James Clements and the Secretary is Erin Gaver.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The SAC reviews and assists with monitoring school-wide data and provides input on priorities, goals, and strategies.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC will continue to provide input on the school improvement plan & process, assist with monitoring school-wide data, share information received from District Advisory Council meetings, administer annual climate survey, distribute school improvement funds consistent with school improvement goals, receive training on school or district initiatives, and hold SAC membership elections for the upcoming year.

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

School improvement funds are allocated based on requests submitted by faculty and staff for projects related to support of school improvement goals. Each request is evaluated by the SAC and voted upon for approval. \$1200 remains in the AHS school improvement fund.

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:

Teresa Marcks

Principal

Years as Administrator:

Years at Current School:

Credentials

MA Educational Leadership
 BS Exceptional Student Education; Specialization in Specific Learning Disabilities
 Certifications:
 School Principal
 Educational Leadership K-12
 Specific Learning Disabilities K-12

Performance Record

2012 - DeBary Elementary School, A school, AYP (71% R/ 71% M; 70% R/ 80% M; 69% R/ 69% M)*
 2011 - DES - A school, AYP 95% (82% R/ 90% M; 69% R/ 74% M; 61% R/ 72% M)*
 2010 - NSBHS - A school, AYP 87% (53% R/ 74% M; 53% R/ 74% M; 43% R/ 65% M)*
 2009 - NSBHS - B School, AYP 79% (50% R/ 73% M; 51% R/ 75% M; 42% R/ 68% M)*
 2008 - NSBHS - A School, AYP 72% (49% R/ 73% M; 55% R/ 81% M; 50% R/ 78% M) *
 2007 - SES - A School, AYP 85% (62% R/ 55% M; 72% R/ 55% M; 81% R/ 63% M) *
 2006 - GMS - A School, AYP 87% (63% R/ 63% M; 64% R/ 66% M; 70% R/ NA M) *
 2005 - GMS - C School, AYP 93% (58% R/ 60% M; 53% R / 62% M ; 61% R / NA - M) *
 2004 - GMS - B School, AYP 83% (60% R/ 61% M; 64% R/ 68% M; 66% R / NA- M)*
 2003 - GMS - A School, AYP NA (59% R/ 61% M; 66% R/ 66% M; 72% R/NA - M) *
 2002 - GMS - A School, AYP NA (61% R/ 63% M; 64% R/ 69% M; 74% R/ NA M) *
 2001 - GMS - B School, AYP NA (50%+ R/ 65%+ M; NA R/NA M; NA R/NA M) *
 2000 - PRHS - C School, AYP NA (19% R/ 46% M; NA R/NA M; NA R/NA M) *
 *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)

Paul Nehrig		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 10	Years at Current School: 4
Credentials	Ed.S. Educational Leadership M.A. English Education B.A. English Certifications: Educational Leadership (all levels) English Education (6-12)	
Performance Record	2013 - School Grade TBD, 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41% R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)* 2011 - School Grade D, AYP 69% (47% R/72% M; 51% R/71% M; 45% R/61% M)* 2010 - B School, AYP 72% (38% R/66% M; 45% R/71% M; 42% R/64% M)* 2009 - B School, AYP 85% (64% R/87% M; 58% R/82% M; 46% R/71% M)* 2008 - A School, AYP 100% (69% R/88% M; 67% R/82% M; 48% R/69% M)* 2007 - B School, AYP 74% (61% R/85% M; 58% R/76% M; 42% R/59% M)* 2006 - B School, AYP 82% (61% R/86% M; 57% R/79% M; 45% R/NA% M)* 2005 - A School, AYP 73% (59% R/85% M; 57% R/81% M; 50% R/NA% M)* *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)	

Efrain Alejandro		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 7	Years at Current School: 5
Credentials	Masters of Science/Administration and Supervision	
Performance Record	2013 - School Grade TBD 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41% R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)* 2011 School Grade D AYP 72% (33% R/69% M; 40% R/70% M; 40% R/62% M)* 2010 B School, AYP 72% (38% R/66% M; 45% R/71% M; 42% R/64% M)* 2009 B School, AYP 85%(51% R/74% M; 57% R/80% M; 46% R/64% M)* 2008 B School, AYP 79% (55% R/79% M; 56% R/76% M; 46% R/65% M)* *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)	

Brian Zinck

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 19

Years at Current School: 8

Credentials

BA Sociology
 M Ed
 Administration
 Certifications:
 Administrative/Supervision
 (grades 1-6)
 Educational
 Leadership (all
 levels)
 Elementary
 Education
 (grades 1-6)
 Mathematics
 (grades 5-9)

Performance Record

2013 - School Grade TBD
 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41%
 R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)*
 2011 - School Grade B , AYP 79% (43%
 R/69%M; 50%R/68%M; 47%R/68%M)
 2010 - School Grade B, AYP 67% (47%
 R/71% M; 52% R/70% M; 45% R/58% M)*
 2009 - C School, AYP 67% (42% R/71% M;
 50% R/74% M;53% R/64% M)*
 2008 - C School, AYP 72% (39% R/69% M;
 54% R/77% M; 54% R/73% M)*
 2007-Communtity Learning Center East,
 AYP 85% (no data available)
 2006 – C School, AYP 67% (33% R/62% M;
 45% R/71% M; 53% R/NA% M)*
 2005 - D School, AYP 53% (34% R/64% M;
 42% R/68% M; 46% R/NA% M)*
 *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains
 R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)

LaTonya Elmore

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 8

Credentials

MS Educational Leadership
 BS Elementary Education
 Certifications:
 Elementary Education 1 - 6,
 English 5 - 9,
 Educational Leadership (all levels)

Performance Record

2013 - School Grade TBD
 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41% R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)*
 2011 - A School, AYP 92% (75% R/73% M; 66% R/69% M; 69% R/73% M)*
 2010 - A School, AYP 74% (73% R/70% M; 61% R/68% M; 54% R/62% M)*
 2009 - D School, AYP 69% (39% R/70% M; 48% R/77% M; 47% R/73% M)*
 2008 - C School, AYP 72% (39% R/70% M; 48% R/77% M; 47% R/73% M)*
 2007 - D School, AYP 72% (37% R/67% M; 47% R/69% M; 41% R/64% M)*
 2006 - C School, AYP 74% (29% R/60% M; 42% R/69% M; 47% R)
 2005 - C School, AYP 70% (33% R/61% M; 45% R/67% M; 50% R)
 *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M)

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Veronica Garrett		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 20
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	BA English Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	
Performance Record	2013 - School Grade TBD 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41% R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)* 2011 - School Grade D, AYP 69% (47% R/72% M; 51% R/71% M; 45% R/61% M)*	

Dawn Alves		
Full-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 15
Areas	Science	
Credentials	BA Exceptional Student Education Certifications in: Specific Learning Disabilities Mental Handicaps Middle Grade Science 5-9 Biology 6-12 CAR-PD Certified	
Performance Record	N/A - first year coaching	

Danielle Leffler		
Full-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	BA Secondary Math Education MA Educational Leadership Certifications in: Math 6-12 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum Physical Education K-12 ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	School Grade TBD	

Melanie Dabbe		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 4	Years at Current School: 2
Areas	Data, Other	
Credentials	BS Exceptional Student Education Certifications: K-12 Exceptional Student Education Elementary Education	
Performance Record	2013 - School Grade TBD 2012 - School Grade D, AYP (41% R/51% M; 51% R/42% M; 59% R/28% M)* 2011 - School Grade A, AYP 92% (75% R/73% M; 69% R/73% M; 66% R/69% M)* 2010 - School Grade A, AYP 74% (66% R/66% M; 73% R/ 70% M; 61% R/68% M; 54% R/62% M)	

Classroom Teachers**# of classroom teachers**

76

receiving effective rating or higher

0%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

, 0%

ESOL endorsed

8, 11%

reading endorsed

8, 11%

with advanced degrees

36, 47%

National Board Certified

2, 3%

first-year teachers

7, 9%

with 1-5 years of experience

5, 7%

with 6-14 years of experience

24, 32%

with 15 or more years of experience

40, 53%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

20

Highly Qualified

20, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above****# receiving effective rating or higher****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

1. New Teacher Programs: District E3, Individualized PD, mentors, peer classroom visits (Administration)
2. Leadership Opportunities (Administration)
3. Professional Development (School-based Leadership Teams)
4. PLC Activities (PLCs)
5. Participation in District Job Fair and Recruitment Activities (Administration)
6. Teacher recognition programs (Administration)

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

All new/beginning teachers are paired with a district PAR teacher for formal mentoring/coaching support. In addition, school-based veteran teachers within each PLC provide mentoring as needed for any new/beginning teachers in that PLC.

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 school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS (Early Warning System, EWS) is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS (EWS) framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with RtI as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school

improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS (EWS) school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS (EWS) results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

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

The school-based MTSS (EWS) leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress.

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

The school-based MTSS (EWS) leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year in order to address the academic and behavioral needs that develop throughout the year, as well as to monitor outcomes of supports and interventions.

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

Pinnacle Gradebook provides evidence of performance in core instruction across content areas. In addition, information gleaned from FAIR assessments, district interim assessments (DIAs), Volusia Writes assessments and FCAT provide valuable information regarding reading performance for both individuals and groups of students. Pinnacle reports provide further information regarding classroom performance by both individual and groups of students in order to inform instruction and intervention. Behavioral expectations are communicated by the school to all students and parents. Those students who do not obtain proficiency in behavioral expectations are provided supports and interventions matched to student need. Office discipline data are maintained and monitored by the school site. Tier 2 and tier 3 supports/interventions and the response to these interventions are monitored through the PST process. The MTSS / Early Warning System (EWS) team coordinates data gathering and review for developing response strategies and communicating areas of need to relevant stakeholders.

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

School-based support for MTSS (EWS) will be provided by the District MTSS (EWS) Leadership Team. In turn, the school-based MTSS (EWS) Leadership team will disseminate relevant MTSS (EWS) information to teachers and parents. Data-based meetings throughout the school year will identify those students in need of academic and/or behavioral supports. Furthermore, based on this data-based decision making, supports will be implemented and monitored. School-specific reports, such as those available in Pinnacle Insight, will facilitate the development of a data-based MTSS framework. This data, in conjunction with identified school-based tiered resources, will ensure that a Multi-Tiered System of Supports is an overarching framework that guides the work of the school.

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: Extended Day for All Students

Minutes added to school year:

Strategy Purpose(s)

""

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

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
	Principal
	Assistant Principal
	Reading Coach
	District Reading Support Teacher
	Department Chairs / Representatives
	Certified School Counselor
	Media Specialist
	Math Coach
	Science Coach

How the school-based LLT functions

The school based LLT identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of literacy supports available to students at our school. The LLT meets monthly on Mondays during lunch for 40 minutes. The LLT Co-chairs provide an agenda and facilitate the meeting. LLT member responsibilities include: attend all meetings to review data, share literacy strategies presented with their PLC, assist with development of classroom implementation strategies, and supervise and support the school-wide writing initiative and implementation of CCSS.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The School-wide Literacy Initiative's main focus is to support reading and writing in every classroom. This year's focus will be on implementation of CCSS and a school-wide writing plan. Literacy council members will be responsible for introducing strategies to their departments and/or PLC's. The LLT has always been dedicated to providing a variety of literacy building events throughout the school year. These would be offered both during school and after school to encourage parent involvement. The LLT

will sponsor 2 school-wide literacy events: a school wide literacy fair in January and activities to support the school-wide writing initiative. Each initiative helps to support reading and writing in every classroom.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Every secondary school has the support of a Reading Coach to ensure that all teachers receive professional development related to current reading research and instructional pedagogy. All classroom teachers integrate Common Core Literacy Standards into their content-specific curriculum to support their students' critical reading and writing skills.

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 school offers students elective courses in art, business, technology, and career study. Many of these courses focus on job skills and offer student internships. A daily focus of the school is for teachers and students to ask each other, "why are we learning this?" to ensure that instruction is always relevant. Teachers are also provided reading materials and "bell ringers" that are based on current events. Our Literacy Leadership Team holds activities throughout the year that bring connections from literacy in the real world to everyday application for our students.

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

Atlantic High School offers students elective courses in art, business, technology, and career study. Many of these courses focus on job skills and offer student internships. Every year, after FCAT testing, students and parents participate in a course selection fair that exposes them to next year's curriculum to inform their course selection. After the course selection fair, students meet one-on-one with a counselor to decide what classes will be taken. Parents are invited to these meetings and final course selection is sent home for parent's signature. Each of our Academies offers four year plans that help guide the students in their career planning including post-secondary education.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

A variety of strategies have been implemented to prepare high school students for post secondary education and employment. Specific programs and or initiatives that are used at the school and district level:

- Dual Enrollment, including on-campus SLS 1122 offering
- Career Academies
- High School Showcase
- AVID
- Career and Technical Education Classes
- Advanced Placement Opportunities
- College Expo
- Making High School Count Programs
- Making College Count Programs
- College Tours

- College Rep Visits
- Early College

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	50%	52%	Yes	55%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	36%	31%	No	42%
Hispanic	54%	42%	No	59%
White	54%	58%	Yes	59%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	35%	38%	Yes	42%
Economically disadvantaged	44%	47%	Yes	50%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	124	28%	31%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	98	22%	25%

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>		40%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		31%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	252	60%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	75	65%	70%

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)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		80%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		35%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		45%

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.	106	60%	75%

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	130	56%	60%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		60%

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	50%	67%	Yes	55%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	34%	46%	Yes	41%
Hispanic				
White	57%	75%	Yes	61%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	37%	41%	Yes	43%
Economically disadvantaged	47%	64%	Yes	52%

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>		25%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		30%

Learning Gains

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)	194	73%	80%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)	50	66%	70%

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.	76	43%	60%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	103	57%	60%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	11	6%	10%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	38	35%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	51	47%	50%

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>		35%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		40%

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	28	33%	50%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	47	56%	40%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		5
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	200	20%	25%

High Schools

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses			
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses			
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	26	2%	3%
CTE-STEM program concentrators			
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	4	0%	3%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		0%	25%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	21	1%	3%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		19%	25%
CTE program concentrators			
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			
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days			
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	56	22%	18%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	135	14%	12%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	42	16%	14%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	316	24%	20%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	394	30%	25%

Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.		0%	
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)		63%	
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.		47%	
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)			

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

AHS will increase participation in the annual Family Night by 10%, to 120 or more families.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase family participation in Family Night by 10%	110	10%	11%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school**Specific Additional Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** The School-Based Leadership Team will develop and implement a school-wide Writing to Learn / Learning to Write plan to increase achievement across the curriculum.

Goals Detail

G1. The School-Based Leadership Team will develop and implement a school-wide Writing to Learn / Learning to Write plan to increase achievement across the curriculum.

Targets Supported

- Writing
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Academic Coaches
- Common Core Training scheduled throughout the year
- State and district support
- On-campus model classrooms for peer observation
- Weekly content-area PLC meetings
- On-campus professional development offered through coaching staff and district personnel
- Basic teacher understanding of CCSS, including some knowledge of Literacy Anchor Standards

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Time (needed for planning, meeting individual student needs)
- Current number of low-level readers and writers

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Improved student achievement data: Volusia Writes, student course grades on interims and report cards, student scores on classroom-level writing assignments

Person or Persons Responsible

PLCs, Academic Coaches and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly

Evidence of Completion:

Grade reports, Volusia Writes data, student writing samples

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. The School-Based Leadership Team will develop and implement a school-wide Writing to Learn / Learning to Write plan to increase achievement across the curriculum.

G1.B1 Time (needed for planning, meeting individual student needs)

G1.B1.S1 A monthly meeting schedule will be implemented school-wide to provide faculty and the SBLT the time needed to plan, review student data, and receive professional development. Common planning time for core academic departments will include weekly PLC meetings. Weekly after-school sessions will rotate among faculty, grade-level, PLC, and department meetings.

Action Step 1

Monthly meeting schedule

Person or Persons Responsible

AHS School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will set and monitor school-wide meeting schedule for all instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing, through May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Meeting agendas, minutes, sign-in sheets.

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

Attendance at meetings by members of the SBLT as appropriate and in instances where no SBLT member is present, agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets will be collected

Person or Persons Responsible

SBLT

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly and/or Monthly as appropriate, ongoing through May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Observation, agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Weekly review of meeting notes at Academic Coaching meetings, classroom observation evidence (by Administrator or Academic Coach), positive student data trends.

Person or Persons Responsible

SBLT

Target Dates or Schedule

At least weekly during Academic Coaching meetings, ongoing through May 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Observation notes and selected student data (for example, Volusia Writes, DIA, classroom assessments)

G1.B2 Current number of low-level readers and writers

G1.B2.S1 Targeted professional development will be provided to identified instructional staff based on teacher and student need

Action Step 1

Assess current status of classroom instruction and student skill level

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Academic Coaches, Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Prior to end of 1st grading period

Evidence of Completion

Data trends / narrative observations shared at coaching meeting

Action Step 2

Identify research-based professional development opportunities such as Lesson Study, Model Classroom, PLC, Technology Integration, Book Study, etc. for instructional staff based on needs assessment

Person or Persons Responsible

State DA, district, and school-based Academic Coaches and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

By November 1

Evidence of Completion

Menu of professional development opportunities

Action Step 3

Provide professional development and follow-up coaching on writing instruction to teachers

Person or Persons Responsible

District specialists, Academic Coaches, peer teachers, state-level DA team specialists

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing through May 2014

Evidence of Completion

PD agendas, sign-in sheets, teacher reflections, classroom observation of writing instruction, follow-up coaching sessions

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Coaching meeting minutes, classroom observation, PD documentation (sign-in sheets, reflections)

Person or Persons Responsible

Academic Coaches and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing through May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Coaching meeting minutes, classroom observation, PD documentation (sign-in sheets, reflections)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Teachers learn, incorporate, and reflect upon new strategies for writing instruction in their classrooms

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Academic Coaches, Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing, through May 2014 (at least monthly)

Evidence of Completion

Classroom observation, teacher reflection, sample lesson plans, student work samples

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

School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds totalling \$18,198 will be used for providing teachers extended before/after school time to meet in PLCs for planning and data analysis, targeted professional development opportunities, procuring technology for classroom use, and implementing Lesson Study (providing substitute teachers for PLC members who come out of the classroom to participate).

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