FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MARCO ISLAND ACADEMY

District Name: Collier

Principal: George Andreozzi

SAC Chair: Jane Watt

Superintendent: Dr. Kamilla Patton

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	George Andreozzi	BA Sociology MS Special Education PD Administration	1	40	
Principal					New School ,opened 2011-2012 School year. 65 students

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

Reading	Joanne Urban	BA/MA Reading	1	30	New to Florida

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	1.Subject Area Professional LearningCommunity 2.Additional Prof.Learning Community AICE, Pre Aice 3. School Based New Teacher Orientation. 4.Evaluation Model based on Marzano 5.Advertise and Interview prospective teachers	Principal " Principal,Mentors Principal	Ongoing Weekly " Ongoing Weekly June 2013	

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
NA	

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
8	0.0%(0)	25.0%(2)	37.5%(3)	37.5%(3)	62.5%(5)	62.5%(5)	12.5%(1)	37.5%(3)	12.5%(1)

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
George Andreozzi	Kelly Monott	Experience of Mentor	Classroom observations, Meetings, Training

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.

. Renee Maile, ESE,ESOL Teacher, Betsy Klemme, Guidance Counselor; Justin Feller, Gifted Coordinator; Amber Prange, AICE Coordinator

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

The RtI Team meets at least once per month, communicates with staff as needed, and monitors the integrity of intervention implementation and data collected. Through the leadership of the RtI Intervention Support Specialist, the RtI team works together with staff in identifying specific student challenges. Problem analysis is used as a first step towards implementation of an appropriate evidence-based intervention. The RtI team also identifies the person or person(s) responsible for implementation, including frequency and necessary data collection to assess the student's response to intervention. A review of the data occurs during implementation and throughout the process; readdressing interventions as needed to most

appropriately serve the student. The school-based RtI Leadership Team supports school-wide efforts to positively impact behavior and academic achievement through the following: resources provided to teachers, individual classroom teachers' research data re: students who may need to leave Tier 1; and active participation in PLCs, student/parent conferences, and data collection. The RtI team works closely with staff who oversees the implementation of school-wide PBS effort known as P.R.O. (Prepared/Respectful

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

The RtI team is collaborative and uses a systematic problem solving process with the goal of significant overall improvement occurring among students. School Improvement goals will include consideration of any discrepancy between what is expected and what is occurring as evidenced by student achievement data.

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.

Individual student data is gathered from the Collier County Public Schools Data Warehouse and other sources including progress monitoring assessments, PLC member discussions, and classroom assessments. This screening data helps determine the effectiveness of core instruction and student progress within the core. Mini-assessments based on focus lessons are administered bi-weekly. The student performance data is analyzed and appropriate instruction is designed. The response to intervention (RtI) model is incorporated in all core courses. In addition, more specific classroom interventions based on collected data are employed for students with specific academic needs. In some cases, supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions are implemented and documented. Mastery is set at 70% to ensure student proficiency of each language arts, reading, and math benchmark. Behavioral data sources including Student Pass and TERMS are also available when assessing students' core achievement. The "Student Snapshot" located in the District's Data Warehouse is utilized as a foundation for academic placement and teacher instruction.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Ongoing process of seminars, staff meetings.
The RtI training is ongoing.
The Intervention Support Specialist will provide individual training as needed for teachers directly involved in the potential movement of a student from one Tier to another.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Supported by Administration, Board of Directors and Parents

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Renee Maile, ESE,ESOL Teacher, Betsy Klemme, Guidance Counselor; Justin Feller, Gifted Coordinator; Amber Prange, AICE Coordinator

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

The LLT will conduct a needs assessment and analysis of the school data for all students taking the FAA in order to make decisions on how to implement the delivery of instruction to target the unique needs of students. The LLT will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies based on instructional targets in daily lesson and the student profile and checkpoint comparison. The team will meet on a monthly basis to monitor progress of all students scoring a Level 1, 2, and 3 on the FAA in the areas of math, reading, writing, or science, and, use the data from district and classroom assessments to determine mastery of access points for each student's level of academic functioning. The use of differentiated instructional delivery strategies will also be evident within the teacher's lesson plans, as well as, throughout professional learning. Based on all information gathered above, the LLT will determine the professional learning and resources needed to optimize instructional and intervention supports to improve instruction in the modified curricula classrooms

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

Improved instruction in Reading through direct systematic instruction is our primary focus. . Additionally, using small group instruction to target specific needs is a major component of our Reading program. Our leadership team will assist in this process by monitoring lesson plans and analyzing benchmark data. The LLT will utilize classroom walkthrough data in order to make midcourse adjustments in instruction. This data will be also analyzed by the instructional coaches to drive coaching practices by modeling, planning, and professional learning communities

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.

NA

*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.

NA

*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?

Career Education students are offered the opportunity to earn a third party industry approved certification which is designed to demonstrate to potential employers the technical skills and abilities for the students. Students also have the opportunity to earn the Florida Ready to Work Credential which is designed to demonstrate to future employers the reading and mathematics skills of the students. The purpose of both credentials is to integrate real world skills and abilities to the instructional objectives for both career and academic courses. In addition all CE programs offer the opportunity to include both On-the-Job Training and or Executive Internships to further show the relationships between high school programs and real world skills.
The LLT will become familiar with Florida's Access Points in Math, Science, and Reading/Language Arts. Access Course Content in the areas of Math and Reading will be incorporated into the Pre-Post Test and Monthly UNIQUE Benchmark Assessments in order to: (1) identify learning gains; (2) assist the IEP team in developing annual goals and objectives; (3) inform instructional planning; and (4) monitor student progress from year to year.

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?

High School Career Academies and CE program teachers encourage all students to complete or update the FACTS.org planning document each school year. Counselors are expected meet regularly with CE students and other interested students to review CE Program of Study for each career education program that is offered at the school. Programs of Study and articulation agreements are available on line on the District website, Career guidance academic counseling provides access for students (and parents, as appropriate) to information regarding career awareness and planning with respect to an individual's occupational and academic future. This counseling also provides information with respect to career options, financial aid, and postsecondary options including college, technical, and post secondary educational opportunities.
Counselors are specifically encouraged to work with CE students in the implementation of the approved Program of Study, and familiarize students with articulations opportunities and other postsecondary programs that are related to high school career pathways. Many CE students and all seniors are encouraged to earn a Florida Ready to Work certificate at the highest level possible. Students are also encouraged to take the appropriate pre-assessments in applied reading, applied math, and locating information tests which are a component of the Florida Ready to Work program.
IEPs will incorporate the student's academic and career planning and guide course selection based on the needs, interests and strengths of the student. Intervention Support Specialists will assist teachers in using the UNIQUE Transition Curriculum and the Attainment: Life Skills to Academics Lessons for Math, Social Studies, Science/Health and Language Arts to aid students in understanding the connection among school, work, and their daily living skills.

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

Planning for postsecondary participation is a critical activity that must begin as a student enters the ninth grade. Schools can support students and parents by placing an emphasis on the following factors:
• Focus on improving and maintaining reading achievement scores
• Focus on improving and maintaining math achievement scores
• Counseling to take upper level math and science courses
• Counseling to take foreign language requirements
• Counseling to more effectively use Bright Futures scholarships such as FI Academic Scholars, FI Medallion Scholars, and FL Gold Seal Vocational Scholarship
• Counseling to enroll in college dual enrollment and AP courses while in high school
• Increase the availability of college dual enrollment courses
• Increasing articulation agreements between Collier County and appropriate post secondary schools
• Counseling to inform students of benefits of articulation agreements in college enrollment
• Counseling to take college placement exams such as CPT, SAT, and ACT
• Counseling to enroll seniors in college level remedial English and mathematics courses
• Increased emphasis on career counseling and career planning for all students with specific focus on postsecondary options
• Focus on FACTS.org as planning tool for college and technical school enrollment
• Increased utilization of technical school dual enrollment as stepping stone to other postsecondary programs
• Increased focus on career academies that lead to college enrollment such as Engineering Academy, Teacher Education Academy, Early Childhood Education Programs, Allied Health Science, and Criminal Justice
• Encourage students to earn Florida Ready to Work certificates and utilize career and college planning on-line assistance

IEP teams will implement with fidelity the UNIQUE Transition Curriculum and the Attainment: Aligning Life Skills to Academics Programs as a supplement to support life skill lessons aligned with math, science/health, social studies, and language.

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:	To increase by 27%[23] students achieving proficiency level 3 on FCAT Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% [27]	27% [50]

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
	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. Students will identify an individual goal for achieving a level 3 or 4 on the scale and write a contract for the work he/she will do to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark.				
	1		1a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration. 1a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop				

			analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. TE will use “close reading” and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading. 1b.1. Provide Universal Design Lessons (UDL) based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the			

			options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation. 1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. 1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.			
2		from reading,1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. .	1b.1. Provide Universal Design Lessons (UDL) based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	1b.1. Principal Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) Raz Kids Discrete Trial Trainer My Reading Coaches CTEM
3	1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses. 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information	1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. 1b.3.	1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members 1b.3. Principal, , Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. . 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and

	from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.			Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
4	1.1 Student level of engagement is based in part on instructional strategies used by the teacher.	1.1 train teachers in Domain 1 Design Q 5 of Marzano Focus on 8 instructional strategies that impact student. Provide ongoing feedback and training	Principal Teachers Reading Specialist	Formal and Informal Observation.classroom Walk throughs. Teacher engagement surveys	CTEM
5	1.2 Learners who are missing pre-requisites skills/competencies are more challenged to reach proficiency levels	1.2 Extended learning opportunities. Individualized academic and behavioral intervention.Progress Monitoring.Use of Bloom's taxonomy. Intensive Reading class.Quarterly chats with Principal	Principal,Teachers,Reading Specialist,Guidance Counselor,Child study Team	Progress Monitoring,Portfolios,Report Cards,Interim Reports,RTL,Discussion at CSteam meetings	End of course exams,Standardized tests,Monitoring, Benchmark assessments Results

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 FY13 goal is to increase by 14%(15) students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5,6) in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29.[36%]	44 [50%]

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	Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	Provide Universal Design Lessons (UDL) based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	1b.1. Principal Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) Raz Kids Discrete Trial Trainer My Reading Coaches CTEM
	1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and	1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus	1b.2. Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy	1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of	1b.2. Assistive Technology

2	Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses. 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. 1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	Leadership Team, IEP Team Members 1b.3. Principal,I, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. . 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM

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:	FY12 Goal is to increase by 7%[16] students achieving above Proficiency levels 4&5 of FCAT in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%[11]	20%[16]

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	2.1 Students level of engagement is based in part on instructional strategies used by the teacher	Train Teachers in Domain1/ Design Quest.5 of Marzano.Focus on 8 instructional strategies that impact student.Provide ongoing feedback and training.	Principal,Teachers,Reading SpecialistChild Study team	Formal and Informal Observation.Classroom Walk throughs,Engagement Surveys	CTEM
2	2.2Students skills and needs can be negatively/positively impacted by the Curriculum provided to address specific learning needs	2.2 Implement pre-AICE course of study for ninth graders Increased rigor of course work for ninth and tenth grade students Using Bloom's taxonomy Questions,Cornell note taking and other research based strategies	2.2 Principal,Teachers,Reading SpecialistChild Study team	2.2Progress monitoring,Data Charts s/t,/s/c/s/a, Interim Reports,Repot Cards, RTI, PMP	2.2Standardized tests,End of Course Exams, Progress Monitoring,Benchmark Assessments Results,Ext. Learning Opportunities,

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
1	2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer	2b.1. Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	2b.1. Progress Monitoring Data-collected through Pre-and Post-test Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills
2	2b.2. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information. 2b.3 Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses.	2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation 2b2. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts. 2b.3 Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement.	2b.2. Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members 2b.3 Principal, , Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	2b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments 2b.3 Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	2b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM 2b.3 Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	FY 12 year Goal is to increase by 5% student 5smaking Learning Gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% [42]	55%[46]

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	3a.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
	3a.2.	3a.1.			3a.1.

	2	Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. 3a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. During small group guided practice (Gradual Release Model-GRM) TE will explain the learning goal and scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark. 3a.2.			1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. During small group guided practice (Gradual Release Model-GRM) TE will explain the learning goal and scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark. 3a.2.

		2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate interventions and supports.			2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate interventions and supports.
	3a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark.	3a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to			3a.3. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

	3	Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. During small group guided practice (Gradual Release Model-GRM) TE will explain the learning goal and scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark. 3a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate interventions and supports.	monitor			
	4		individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. TE will use “close reading” and other tools to prepare students for			

		complex text reading.			
5	3.1 Students level of engagement is based in part on instructional strategies used by the teacher	3.1 Train teachers in Domain 1/Design,Q 5 of Marzano. Focus on 8 instructional strategies that impact student engagement.Provide ongoing training and feedback.	3.1Principal,Teachers,Child Study Team	3.1 Formal and Informal Observation.Classroom Walk throughs,Engagement Surveys	CTEM
6	3.2 Learners who are missing pre-requisiteskills/competencies are more challenged to reach proficiency.Ie gaps inin learning,prior knowledge, vocabulary etc.	3.2Extended learning opportunities,Individual academic and behavioral intervention,Progress monitoring,Increased rigor of course work, Use of Bloom's Taxonomy,Quaterly data chats with Principal, Reading Specialist,Teacher, Child Study Team.	3.2 Principal,Teachers,Child Study Team	3.2 Progress monitoring,Data Charts s/t,/s/c/s/a, Interim Reports,Repot Cards, RTI, PMP	3.2 Standardized tests,End of Course Exams, Progress Monitoring,Benchmark Assessments Results,Ext. Learning Opportunities

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 FY 12 Goal is to increase by 7% students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% [20]	31%[26]

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
	4a.1.	4a.1.			4a.1.

	1	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide sguided practice/scaffolded			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			support daily or as needed (OPM)			
	2	guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM)	4a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.			4a.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
	3	4a.3 Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	4a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal4a.3. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item			4a.3. Quarterly Assessment Data –

		complexity rating			
4	4b.1. Students' fluency deficits hinder their ability to recognize and decode printed words, match sounds and symbols, build sight words and read fluently	4b.1. a) Provide instruction through the use of concrete, step-by-step teaching utilizing a prompt hierarchy and frequent repetition b) Focus instruction on functional academics c) Modify the levels of support for task completion and design listening centers based on students' depth of knowledge.	4b.1. Principal, , Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team , IEP Team Members	4b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	4b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
5	4b.2. Students' lack of an established mode of communication limits their ability to provide a consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) response. 4b.3 Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	4b.2. Teachers will provide instruction through the use of direct picture support to provide and build content meaning, and elicit a consistent and readable (discernible) response as the primary goal for student engagement and participation. 4b.3. Teachers will use pictures and text features in order to: support comprehension, identify main ideas from information, use simple graphs/charts (to get information) and follow simple and sequenced directions.	4b.3 Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team , IEP Team Members	4b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	4b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
6	4.1 Students level of engagement is based in part on instructional strategies used by the teacher	4,1 Train teachers in Domain 1/Design,Q 5 of Marzano. Focus on 8 instructional strategies that impact student engagement.Provide ongoing training and feedback	4.1 Principal, Teachers, Child Study Team	4.1 Formal and Informal Observation.Classroom Walk throughs,Engagement Surveys	4.1 CTEM
7	4.2 Learners who are missing pre-requisiteskills/competencies are more challenged to reach proficiency.Ie gaps inin learning,prior knowledge, vocabulary etc	4.2 Extended learning opportunities,Individual academic and behavioral intervention,Progress monitoring,Increased rigor of course work, Use of Bloom's Taxonomy,Quaterly data chats with Principal, Reading Specialist,Teacher, Child Study Team.	4.2 Principal,Guidance Counsellor, Child Study Team, Reading Specialist, Support Specialist	4.2 Progress monitoring,Data Charts s/t,/s/c/s/a, Interim Reports,Repot Cards, RTI, PMP	4.2 Standardized tests,End of Course Exams, Progress Monitoring,Benchmark Assessments Results,Ext. Learning Opportunities,

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	
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
1	NA				
2	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

3		achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			
4	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
5	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			
6	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
7	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			
8	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
9	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

		2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			
10	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
11	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks,	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated

12	opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
13	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating 5D.2. Quarterly Assessment

14	5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction	1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2			Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

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
1	NA				

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 FY13 goal is to increase the learning gains of the students in SWD subgroup not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Reading by 3%. .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%/7	5% / 4

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	NA				
2	NA				
3	NA				
4	NA				
5	NA				
6	NA				
7	Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. 1c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
8	5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have	5D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
9	5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have	5D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
10	not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies,			

		working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices			

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
1	na				
2	na				

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						

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Algebra 1 Goal #1: The FY13 goal is to increase the students achieving proficiency in Algebra I by 6% [2]
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% [8]	29% [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	Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. .	1.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful			1.1. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scalscale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. Students will identify a goal for achieving a level 3 or 4 on the scale and write a contract for the work he/she will do to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark.			
2	1.2. ctiInteractive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform prace	1.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
3	1.2. ctiInteractive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform prace	1.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
4	across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and			

		acceleration.			
5	across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration.			
6	across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration.			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating
7	1.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study			1.3. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

		and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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:	The FY13 goal is to increase the students achieving proficiency in Algebra I levels 4 and 5 by 10%[1.2]
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34%/ 12	44%/ 13.2

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	2.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each			2.1. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

	1		standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. Students will be expected to achieve a 4 on the scale by extending their learning. TE will work with high achieving students to identify specific work that will meet the requirements.			
		2.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. 2.3 Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	2.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely			2.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating .3 Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

2		utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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 :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:

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:

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:	The FY113 goal is 80% [24 of 30] of students achieving proficiency in geometry .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% [9 of 17]	80%[24of 30]

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 Geometry. Geometry 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 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 :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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
Evaluation Model (CTEM)	9-12	Principal,	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2011; early release days, teacher	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership	Administrators, Department Heads, Peer Teachers, CTEM Teacher
Marzano's Learning Framework	9-12	Principal, Teachers (PLC Leaders	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, Human Resource Personnel	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Teachers, District Personnel
AICE	9 -12	Principal, Curriculum/ Instructi	School-based AICE Coordinator / Instruction, Teachers of Pre-AICE	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC	Principal, Curriculum/ Instruction, CTEM Teacher, Teachers

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

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:	Biology 1 Goal #1: The FY13 goal is to increase the students achieving proficiency in Biology (EOC) by5%[2]
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% [36[	95%[38]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students			1.1. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. Utilize 5E model of science instruction with fidelity, emphasizing hands-on opportunities, notebooking and vocabulary development. Display LG and scale to demonstrate high expectations for mastery of the standard/benchmark. In science notebooks, students will identify an achievement level (3 or 4) and the work they will do to demonstrate mastery. To ensure that students are making progress toward mastery, a minimum of weekly, require text-dependent written responses to questions from quadrants 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK.				
2	1.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	1.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration.			1.2. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating	
	1.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific	1.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the			1.3. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating	

3	strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies (Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area reading.			

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:	The FY13 goal is to increase the students achieving proficiency in Biology (EOC) by5%[2]
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

90% [36[	95%[38]

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	2.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	2.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators willdetermine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. Students will be expected to set a goal for achieving a 4 on			2.1. Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

			the scale and will identify the work they will do to demonstrate exemplary mastery of the standard/benchmark. Ex.: For text-dependent written responses, students must reference a minimum of 2 outside sources to either support or refute the student's conclusions. TE will provide scaffolded support in order to develop students' ability to successfully meet this expectation.					
	2	2.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	mpre hension.2.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student co			Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating		
		2.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	2.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in			2.3 Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating		

	3		using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate tothe text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies (Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area reading. the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught					

		standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies (Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area reading.			

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
Textbook (Newly Adopted)	9-12	Principal for Curriculum/ Instruction, District Science Coordinator, Teachers	Science Teachers	Ongoing beginning in June 2012	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback	
Marzano's Learning Framework	9-12	Principal, Curriculum/ Instruction, Teachers (PLC Leaders),	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, District Human Resource Personnel	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership Council agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Teachers, District personnel
Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM)	9-12	Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum/ Instruction, Teachers	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, Human Resource Personnel, Teachers	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Peer Teachers, CTEM District Personnel

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Writing Goal #1A: The FY13 goal is to increase the students achieving proficiency in Writing by 2%. This 2% equates to 95 students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90%[60.]	92%/[95]

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
	1a.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of			1a.1. Quarterly Writing Prompt

	1		rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. To ensure rigorous expectations for student writing, a minimum of 50% of student writing will be content-based written responses to multiple texts and demonstrate thinking skills appropriate to levels 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK. 1e. In all content areas when assestudent responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence. 1f. To ensure rigorous expectations for student writing, Baseline, End of Quarter 1, End of Quarter 2, and EOY writing assessments will be administered with opportunity for and focus on revision based on teacher feedback.					
		1a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Instructional: Data-driven planning,	1a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and			1a.2. Quarterly Writing Prompt		

	2	instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Meeting minutes will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. 2d. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension					
	3	1a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be providedprofessional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught			1a.3. Quarterly Writing Prompt		

		standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence.			

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
AICE	9	Principal, Instruction, AICE School-based Coordinator, AICE Regional Coordinat	Teachers of Pre-AICE	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback	Principal, for Curriculum/ Instruction, , Teachers

Marzano's Learning	9-12	Principal, Curriculum/ Instruction, Teachers (PLC Leaders),	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, District Human Resource Pers	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership Council agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Teachers
Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM)	9-12	Principal, Curriculum/ Instruction, Teachers	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, District Human Resource Personnel, Teachers	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership Council agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Peer Teachers, CTEM Teacher

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

U.S. History End-of-Cource (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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.)			
	1.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehens	1.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop			

2		analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Use Intertextual Triad and Cl			

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	NA
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
98%	0

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
0	0
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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						

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The FY13 goal is to decrease the number of out of school suspensions by50 %
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
4	4
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4	4

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Student behavior can be inconsistent and/or unpredictable	Increase PBS incentives ??Maintain visibility of staff throughout campus. ??Communicate behavior expectations to students and parents through a variety of venues including but not limited to school newsletter, new student orientation, class meetings, school website	1.1. Principal; Guidance Counselors; Teachers; Intervention Support Specialist, RtI Committee, PBS Committee, Students; Parent	1.1. Review suspension data monthly	TERMS, District system for discipline reporting

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
NA						

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: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	NA
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
0	0
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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						

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas

in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	The FY 12 goal is to increase the percentage of parental volunteers by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
18% [15]	22%[18]

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 There is a limited data base of parent/ guardian email addresses	1.1 Transfer email addresses from emergency list. Call parents who did not list email on card..Request email addresses at time of enrollment. Explain need for email address in Newsletter [Monthly].Increase email “blasts’ to those in the data base.	1.1 Principal,Teachers,Child Study Team Volunteer coordinator	1.1 Quarterly monitoring of email base	1.1 District system data located in Winocular
2	1.2 There may be a lack of understanding among some parents of registration process that leads to documentation ofinvolvement.	1.2 Provide written instruction for volunteer registration to all parent groups[ie sports etc.],PTA,CAP Include need for volunteers and the process in Newsletters and email blasts. Monthly meeting with parent volunteer coordinator	1.2 Principal,Guidance Counselor, Child Study Team, ReadingSpecialist, SupportSpecialist Volunteer coordinator, Clerical personnel	1.2 Quarterly monitoring of email base	1.2 District system data located in Winocular

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	STEM Goal #1: 100% [106] students will participate in STEM Activities

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students' level of engagement is based, in part, on instructional strategies used by the Teacher	.1. ? Teachers will use Five-E model: engagement,exploration, explanation, elaboration, evaluation; ? Train teachers in the Art and Science of Teaching focusing on Domain 1 of Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework. Domain 1 identifies 41 instructional categories that happen in the classroom. ??Teachers will receive ongoing feedback and training re: the implementation of research-based classroom strategies designed to	1.1. Cambridge/AICE Personnel, Teachers, Students Principal	1.1. Formal, Informal Observations; Classroom Walk Throughs; (All using Marzano's Framework Protocols	1.1. Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM)

		improve teachers instructional expertise leading to greater student engagement and achievement			
2	1.2. Learners who are missing pre-requisite skills /competencies are more challenged to reach proficient levels of achievement Missing deficiencies may include but not be limited to academic vocabulary.	1.2. ??Appropriate course placement; ??quarterly data chats between student and teacher mentor; ? learning opportunities; ??academic and behavioral interventions; ??progress monitoring; ??Increased rigor of coursework for ninth and tenth grade students through use of Student-Generated Bloom's Taxonomy Questions, Cornell Note Taking and other research	1.2. Administrators, Counselors, Intervention Support Specialist, Teachers, Students	1.2. Progress Monitoring; student-teacher; student-counselor; Interim Reports; Report Cards; RtI PMPs (Progress Monitoring Plans); Varied assessment tools	1.2. Standardized tests, End of course exams, Progress Monitoring and Benchmark Assessments; Extended Learni ng Results,
3	1.3 Students' skills and competencies can be negatively/positively impacted by the curriculum provided to address specific learning needs	1.3. Implement Pre-AICE curriculum in biology; ??Provide AICE training from Cambridge; Cousteau Program	1.3. Administrators, teachers, Cambridge personnel, Dr. Murphy [Cousteau Program}	1.3. Progress Monitoring; data chats between student-teacher; student-counselor; Interim Reports; Report Cards; RtI PMPs (Progress Monitoring Plans); Varied assessment tools	11.3. Progress Monitoring; data chats between student-teacher; student-counselor; Interim Reports; Report Cards; RtI PMPs (Progress Monitoring Plans); Varied assessment tools

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
Marzano's LearningFramework	9-11	Principal, Teachers (PLC Leaders), Dr. Murphy [Cousteau]	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators Human Resource Personne	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback	Administrators, Department Heads, Teachers,

Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM)	9-11	Principal, Teachers Dr. Murphy	Administrators, Teachers, Counselors, District Subject Area Coordinators, Human Resource Personnel, Teachers	Ongoing throughout school year beginning August 2012; early release days, teacher in-service days, district in-service days	Formal/Informal observations, classroom walk-throughs; reflective questioning; PLC discussion/feedback; Leadership Council agendas	Administrators, Department Heads, Peer Teachers, CTEM

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority ( ) Focus ( ) Prevent (•) 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 (Uploaded on 10/23/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Each member of the School Advisory Council (SAC) is expected to be an active participant in regularly scheduled SAC meetings and other related activities (i.e. new student orientation, Open House, etc.). Although elected from a peer group, members are expected to strive for the common good of the school rather than narrow representation of the peer group. The SAC serves in an advisory capacity and shall assume none of the powers or duties now reserved by Florida Statutes for the School Board, the principal, or

other administrative or instructional staff. In the event a conflict emerges between the SAC and the principal, the law which makes the SAC advisory to the principal will prevail. The duties of the SAC shall be as follows: 1) Assist in the development , implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and the Annual Report of Educational Improvement; 2) Review the results of all needs assessments; 3) Prepare and distribute information to the public to report the status of implementing the School Improvement Plan, the performance of students and educational programs, and progression in accomplishing the school goals; 4) Serve as a resource for the principal; 5) Provide assistance as the principal may request in the preparation of the school budget (FS1008.385(1)). 6) Approve expenditures of school improvement funds; 7) Act as a liaison between the school and the community; 8) Consult with persons or departments for assistance regarding the school improvement process and other school related matters

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
No Data Found
No Data Found