

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: DIXIE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Dixie

Principal: Diana Locke

SAC Chair: Karen VanAernam

Superintendent: Mark A. Rains

Date of School Board Approval: pending School Board approval

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Diana Locke	M. Ed Ed. Leadership	13	3	Gains were evident in reading and writing; however, the school did not make AYP. The number of absences and tardies decreased considerably.
Assis Principal	Jerry Wayne Evans	M. Ed Ed. Leadership	3	2	Gains were evident in reading and writing; however the school did not make AYP. The number of discipline referrals decreased considerably.

### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide
--	--	--	------	---------------	---

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Mari-Michael Smith	MG Social Science (5-9) Reading Endorsement	2	4	Lowest 25% above state average Gains evident in reading

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Teach in Florida web site	Principal	as needed when vacancies arise	
2	Teacherteacher.com	Principal	as needed when vacancies arise	
3	NEFEC Recruiting Day	Principal	as needed when vacancies arise	
4	College Recruiting Day	Principal	as needed when vacancies arise	
5	Mentoring Program	Chairman of mentoring program	ongoing	
6	Global Teacher Research and Resources Organization	Principal	as needed when vacancies arise	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
The percentage of instructional staff teaching out-of-field is 9%(3).	The strategies being implemented are NEFEC professional development programs and the school's mentoring program.

## Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
27	18.5%(5)	40.7%(11)	14.8%(4)	25.9%(7)	40.7%(11)	88.9%(24)	25.9%(7)	0.0%(0)	22.2%(6)

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
		experienced	acclimation to

Dale Joslin	Jamie Corbin	teacher to first- year teacher	procedures, classroom management, planning, professional goals
Rambabu Kastala	Soakumar Soman-Nadar	experienced teacher to first-year teacher	acclimation to procedures, classroom management, planning, professional goals
Carol Petrone	Yamini Mital	experienced teacher to first-year teacher	acclimation to procedures, classroom management, planning, professional goals
Mari-Michael Smith	Jose Busot	experienced teacher to first-year teacher	acclimation to procedures, classroom management, planning, professional goals
Deborah Hodge	Rocco Sementelli	experienced teacher to first-year teacher	acclimation to procedures, classroom management, planning, professional goals

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI Leadership Team will be the reading coach and three teachers. The principal will serve as a resource person for the team.

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

The team will meet weekly to discuss strategies and student needs. The reading coach will serve as facilitator for the team with the principal as a resource person. The reading coach will work with academic teachers to identify the students for the program and screen those students when needed. The team will work cooperatively to determine strategies and instructional practices to address the students' needs and then determine the best assessment for the students. The teachers will meet with students either in a small group or on an individual basis. The team will work collaboratively to decide the best progress monitoring system.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RTI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The principal is a member of the school advisory committee thus providing input in the school improvement plan.

#### MTSS Implementation

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

Dixie County High School will utilize DiscoveryEd, Skyward and FAIR to address the data. Student logs will also be used to monitor progress and target challenging areas and areas of improvement.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff will review the practices and procedures during the first week of pre-planning. Teachers new to the school will receive formal training during their first new faculty meeting during pre-planning.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is composed of the reading coach, the principal, two teachers elected by the staff and two teachers appointed by the reading coach and principal.

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

The LLT meets monthly to review data, to monitor assessments, to promote ongoing improvement and to address the goals developed for the 2012-2013 academic year.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT for the academic year 2012-2013 are as follows:

1. to increase the percentage of growth for the students in the bottom quartile to 72%.
2. to increase the percentage of students who are considered high performing to 55%.
3. to increase the percentage of students who score 4 or above on the Florida Writes! to 80%.
4. to develop a vertical articulation plan per grade level.
5. to assist in the curriculum mapping initiative through professional development opportunities in data assessment and reading and writing activities across the curriculum.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

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

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The reading coach attends departmental and grade-level meetings to ensure that all teachers understand their role in instructing reading strategies. The reading coach also conducts classroom observations to provide additional support to teachers in reading strategy instruction. The reading coach provides numerous professional development opportunities for teachers to strengthen their reading strategy instruction.

### \*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

Through department and grade-level meetings, teachers collaborate to increase activities for students to understand the relevance of the learning to their future needs. The school is undergoing a curriculum mapping project which will increase opportunities in this area and promote more authentic tasks and authentic assessments.

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

The guidance department provides workshops for parents and students to assist in the planning of the students' academic and career planning. Two full-time guidance counselors provide one-on-one assistance to address individual needs. The school is planning a "College and Career Fair" in the fall of 2013 to assist students in their planning.

## Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

The school has developed a BRIC (Building Rigorous Instruction through Collaboration), whereby departments have a common planning period that allows department members to have meaningful discussions to address strategies and methodologies that promote student readiness for the postsecondary level.

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The school did not make AYP in reading last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% of the students scored a level 3.	55% of the students will score a level 3.

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historically, students have difficulty with using reading strategies and have limited vocabulary.	Students will be monitored using assessments to determine strengths and weaknesses. Students will also monitor their own progress through student logs and participate in new courses based on improving reading strategies.	Reading Coach Reading Department	FAIR, Skyward, DiscoveryEd, Achieve 3000, student logs	FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The current level of performance will remain the same for 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%(1)	100%(1)

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	need for professional development for teachers in complex text and for teacher time to participate in the professional development	will provide professional development during common planning time	Reading Coach Principal	classroom observations	1. professional development agenda 2. department meeting minutes 3. classroom

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The school did not make AYP in reading last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (34) of the students scored a level 4 or 5.	30% of the students will score a level 4 or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historically, the students have difficulty with the reading FCAT.	The students will be assessed in December and in March to determine strengths and weaknesses.	Reading Coach	scores on assessments	FCAT FAIR DiscoveryEd
2	A need exists for professional development for teachers in reading complex text plus additional time for the professional development.	Teachers will receive professional development during common planning time.	Reading Coach Principal	classroom observations	1. Department meeting agendas 2. Department meeting minutes 3. Classroom observations

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	The school did not make AYP in reading last year.
--	---



Reading Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (70) of the students made gains.	68% of the students will make gains this year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historically, the students do not perform well in reading.	Students will be monitored in December and in March to assess strengths and weaknesses.	Reading Coach	results of assessments	FCAT FAIR DiscoveryEd
2	In class the students have varied individual needs.	Students will work in small groups, as needed.	Reading Coach Paraprofessional	1. Bi-weekly progress monitoring for all level 1 and 2 students 2. Research class for all level 3 students 3. Level 4 and 5 students placed in honors courses	1. Bi-weekly comprehension test 2. Achieve 3000 3. Teacher-created assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	The school did not make AYP in reading last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (61 students) of the students showed growth.	72% of the students will show growth.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historically, many students in this category do not show gains.	The students will be assessed in December and in March to determine strengths and weaknesses.	Reading Coach	assessment results	FCAT
2	1. Lower performing students lack motivation. 2. Absenteeism is a factor.	The students will participate in small group instruction, and student progress will be closely monitored. The guidance department will assist in the monitoring.	Reading Coach Guidance Counselors	weekly checks with students and data chats	Data chats with students

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The school did not make AYP for 2011-2012. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	52	55				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	The school will strive to decrease this percentage by 2% from the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% failed to make satisfactory progress in reading.	45% will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	A large number of white students performed below grade level for two or more years.	Remediation will be provided to struggling readers based on individual needs.	Reading Coach Paraprofessional	1. Bi-weekly progress monitoring for level 1 and 2 students 2. Achieve 3000 for level 3 students	1. Comprehension tests 2. Achieve 3000

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The school desires to decrease the students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%	70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	A large number of SWD's are performing two or more years below grade level.	provide remediation to low performing students based on needs	Reading Coach	Bi-weekly progress monitoring with level 1 and 2 students Achieve 3000 for level 3 students	Comprehension test Achieve 3000

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Close reading CIS CCSS	9-12	Reading Coach	PLC through weekly department meetings/school-wide	1. early release days 2. professional development occurring once a month at department meetings/ school-wide	1. department meeting 2. observations	Reading Coach Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hampton-Brown Edge	interactive student practice book reading book library	adopted textbook fund	\$2,400.00
			Subtotal: \$2,400.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Achieve 3000			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CIS Close Reading Webinar from Hampton-Brown			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
vocabulary from literature informational text study	various genres of literature Scholastic Choice Magazine Scholastic Science World		\$3,700.00
			Subtotal: \$3,700.00
			Grand Total: \$6,100.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal #1:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

# Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #3:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	

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

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	80% of the students will pass Algebra I EOC or show one year's growth.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	65%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	low reading level	develop vocabulary and practice problem solving	classroom teacher	skill tests and including vocabulary in tests and quizzes	skills tests and EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Increase the number of students scoring at a level 4 or 5
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6%	20%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	student effort	after school tutoring and improved note-taking	tutor	benchmark tests and progress monitoring	DiscoveryEd



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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Algebra Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #3D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #3E:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #1:

80% of students will pass the geometry EOC or show growth.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA	65%				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	lack of willingness to complete assigned tasks	parent/teacher calls	classroom teacher	increased completion of assignments	Skyward

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	Increase number of students achieving level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	20%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	lack of student effort	tutoring improved notetaking Collins writing	tutor classroom teacher	Benchmark tests and progress monitoring	DiscoveryEd

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	
---	--

Geometry Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Collins Writing	9-10/Algebra I, geometry	Media Specialist	school-wide	early release dates, monthly	incorporate in lesson plans	Department Chair

Mathematics Budget:

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

## Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:		The school desires to have a high percentage of students pass.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
No data		67% will pass.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have not had a strong background in the sciences.	The biology teacher is new and has a strong, experienced background in biology.	principal	lesson plans classroom observations	EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

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

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands-on experience	Lab supplies	grant	\$16,000.00
			Subtotal: \$16,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$16,000.00</b>

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	The expectation is to increase the percentage of students scoring a 4.0 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In writing 78% of the students scored a 3.0 and higher.	In 2013, 80% of the students will score a 3.0 or higher.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Changes to the writing requirements and expectations will require teacher training and student acclimation.	In English the students will keep a portfolio of their writings. Teachers in math, science and social studies will include opportunities for writing.	sophomore teachers	The students will keep a portfolio of their writings and will reflect on strengths and weaknesses quarterly.	Student performance on writing and students' quarterly reflections

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring	
--	--



at 4 or higher in writing.				
Writing Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

*End of U.S. History EOC Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	To decrease the number of students who have excessive absences from 49% to 45% (241 students). To decrease the number of students who have excessive tardies from 13% to 10% (54 students).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The current attendance rate is 91% or 460 students.	The expected attendance rate will be 92%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
249 students had ten or more absences which was 49% of the student body.	The number of students with excessive absences will decrease from 49% to 45%, which is 241 students.

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
66 students had ten or more tardies which was 13% of the student body.	The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease from 13% to 10%.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Attendance has been a continuous problem over the past five years.	A new attendance policy, outlined in the student handbook, has been instituted.	teachers, guidance personnel	Attendance data reports per nine weeks	Attendance data at the end of the school year, 2012-2013

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:		The school is desirous of raising the percentage of students who graduate and lowering the dropout rate.			
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:			
5% (6 students) dropped out of school.		4% of the students will drop out of school.			
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:			
79.8% of the senior class graduated.		85% of the students will graduate.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	successfully identifying	1. Identifying and	principal,	Continuous monitoring	dropout and

1	the at-risk students	counseling at-risk students beginning in ninth grade 2. Contacting parents about attendance 3. Monitoring students who make D's and F's 4. Offering the Blue Ridge Credit Recovery Program during and after school and during the summer 5. Providing small group instruction at the Save Center for at-risk students	guidance personnel, teachers	of the various strategies	graduation rates
---	----------------------	---	------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

# Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement				
Parent Involvement Goal #1:				
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

## Parent Involvement Budget:

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



Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

### Curriculum Mapping Goal:

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

<p>1. Curriculum Mapping Goal</p> <p>Curriculum Mapping Goal #1:</p>	<p>To establish and implement the staff development model to be used to inform and train all staff members in curriculum mapping and curriculum design.</p> <p>To align the 9-12 curriculum to provide students with smooth transitioning in the acquisition of all knowledge and skills necessary to meet the Common Core Standards and 21st century skills.</p> <p>To develop processes that: (1) provide collaboration among classroom teachers, the media specialist, the reading coach and administrators; (2) promote coordination/standardization of the learning experiences 9-12; (3) enable the dissemination of learning experiences to ensure that students receive all knowledge and skills necessary to meet the Common Core Standards and 21st century skills.</p> <p>To create and/or implement the use of assessments to align/standardize curriculum 9-12:: (1) create scoring rubrics matched to FCAT//AP models that assess student writing; 2) analyze data gathered from the Florida Department of Education and FCAT to continually update curricular needs; (3) chart the progress of curriculum renewal process on an ongoing basis.</p>
--	---

2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
---------------------	----------------------

The curriculum needs subject and grade level alignment to increase student achievement as well as alignment to the vision and mission of the school.	Student achievement goals will be reached based on strengthening curriculum development.
--	--

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	teacher buy-in, staff understanding of curriculum design and curriculum mapping process	<p>Presentation to teachers and administrators on the curriculum renewal process using curriculum mapping; prepare lesson plans for curriculum mapping process</p> <p>Training on developing "delivered curriculum" maps; determination on classes mapped; development of glossary terms for consistency (ongoing); columns in map</p> <p>Training on 21st century skills</p> <p>All teachers will map</p>	administrators, department chairs, curriculum mapping coordinator	quality of "delivered curriculum" maps; review and assessment of curriculum	curriculum review and assessment

		their "delivered curriculum"(what is actually occurring in the classroom)		
--	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

Budget:

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

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Hampton-Brown Edge	interactive student practice book reading book library	adopted textbook fund	\$2,400.00
				Subtotal: \$2,400.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Achieve 3000			\$0.00
Science	Hands-on experience	Lab supplies	grant	\$16,000.00
				Subtotal: \$16,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	CIS Close Reading Webinar from Hampton-Brown			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	vocabulary from literature informational text study	various genres of literature Scholastic Choice Magazine Scholastic Science World		\$3,700.00
				Subtotal: \$3,700.00
				Grand Total: \$22,100.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Academic Awards Ceremony Science Fair Professional Development for Teachers College and Career Day	\$2,500.00

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

SAC will be involved in the planning of a "College and Career Day" for all students in the Fall of 2013. SAC will also be involved in events that recognize student achievement, such as academic awards and participation in the science fair. SAC will support teachers in various professional development opportunities.

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dixie School District DIXIE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	84%	78%	33%	247	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	54%	87%			141	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	47% (NO)	93% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					528	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dixie School District DIXIE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	49%	70%	89%	28%	236	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	47%	66%			113	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	31% (NO)	59% (YES)			90	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					439	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested