

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SARASOTA SCHOOL OF ARTS/SCIENCES

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Tara Tahmosh-Newell

SAC Chair: Tara Tahmosh-Newell

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval: 1997

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

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	Tara Tahmosh-Newell	B.S. Secondary English Education M.Ed. Ed Leadership Secondary English Education 6-12 ESOL K-12 Educational Leadership K-12	12	3	SSA+S school grade of A, 100% met AYP Rated 12th middle school in the State of Florida
Assis Principal	Carl Williams	B.A. Int. Social Sciences M.Ed. Ed Leadership Middle Grades Integrated ESE K-12 Ed. Leadership K-12	2	3	SSA+S, school grade of A, 100% met AYP Rated 12th middle school in the State of Florida

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.

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)
No data submitted				

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 We will continue to utilize teams when interviewing for any vacancy. We started this last summer and it has been very successful. We use Teach In Florida to find qualified teachers. Mentors have been assigned to each new teacher, and the mentor and Department Head work collaboratively with the new teacher.	Administration, Mentors, Department Heads	Ongoing	

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
No data submitted	

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
43	4.7%(2)	14.0%(6)	62.8%(27)	11.6%(5)	34.9%(15)	232.6% (100)	2.3%(1)	0.0%(0)	16.3%(7)

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
			Utilize the Sarasota County Induction

Brian Sutliff	Patricia Sanchez	Same subject area.	Program, including the checklist, evaluation forms, and attached activities.
Kylie Gannon	Meghan Burrows	Same subject Experienced mentor	Utilize the Sarasota County Induction Program, including the checklist, evaluation forms, and attached activities.
Trevor Bliss	Megan Cushman	Same subject Experienced mentor	Utilize the Sarasota County Induction Program, including the checklist, evaluation forms, and attached activities.
Lauren Watson	Miles Digati	Same subject	Utilize the Sarasota County Induction Program, including the checklist, evaluation forms, and attached activities.

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.

Tara Tahmosh-Newell, Principal
Carl Williams, Assistant Principal
Georgia Plath, ESE Liaison
Mike Mapes, Guidance Counselor
Sarah Shepherd, Teacher

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?

CARE Team information is reported to the SWST.
Bimonthly meetings occur, with updates on current students in the RtI process, as well as new students that may need interventions.
Interventions are developed and recorded.
Interventions are presented to the family and teachers.

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 leadership team has several members that also complete the school improvement plan, therefore the process of both efforts are seamless with the incorporation of goals that help all students achieve.

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.

Tier II data sources and management systems include: FAIR reports, READ 180 reports, SRI scores, and Vmath reports.
Tier III data sources and management systems include: individual instruction gathered by ESE, resource, and regular education teachers.

Tier II & III behavioral interventions are developed using Functional Behavior Assessments, teachers are informed, and complete bimonthly data reports.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A district administrator, Rex Ingerick taught the faculty and staff the FBA process.
A short training was completed during the 2010-11 school year.
Teachers are trained on a one-on-one basis for each particular student in the process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Kylie Gannon, Department Head
Tara Tahmosh-Newell, Principal
Lauren Malecki, Language Arts teacher
James Deree, Language Arts teacher
Courtney Price, Language Arts teacher
Ericka Sciarrino, Language Arts teacher
Liz Smith, Language Arts teacher
Mary Boisclair, Reading Lab teacher
Della Lowe, Reading Lab teacher

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

The language arts department is led by Kylie Gannon. She meets with administration once a month concerning literacy goals. The following week, she meets with her department, reports the information and assesses literacy needs.

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

Increasing nonfiction literacy within all subgroups.
Increasing academic vocabulary literacy.
Increasing computer-based testing in the classroom.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Department Heads meet each month with administration. They then meet with their respective department members once each month.
Grade level meetings also occur each month.
School wide staff meetings occur once per month.
Strategies are shared within each of these meetings.

*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?

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?

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](#)

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 32%(237) Level 3,4,5 - 77%(571)	Level 3 - 36% Level 3,4,5 - 79%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading 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				

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 45%(334) Level 3,4,5 - 77%(571)	Level 4,5 - 49% Level 3,4,5 - 79%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students above proficient scoring a level 4 or 5 stagnate within a heterogenous class.	Advanced courses in: language arts mathematics science Gifted History Honors courses in: Algebra Geometry High School courses in: Speech Career Prep and Tech Spanishl	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of yearly FCAT scores.	FCAT End of Course Exams

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(451)	72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%(72)	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	Students in the lowest quartile may be significantly behind their peers who are at or above proficient levels.	Students from our lowest quartile will be scheduled into intervention courses and/or individual intensive reading courses depending upon level.	Guidance Counselor Principal	All students from our lowest quartile will have intensive reading instruction either as a stand alone class, as part of the fusion model, or through a Content Area Reading class.	Examine FCAT results and school wide student schedules to check accuracy of student

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	83	84	86	87	89	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 83%(418) Hispanic 71%(85) Black 42%(17) Asian 85%(17)	White 88% Hispanic 77% Black 64% Asian 81% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or
--	---

Reading Goal #5C:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%	52%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the ELL program may score lower than their peers of the same knowledge level.	Short and extended response testing instead of multiple choice exams.	Classroom Teacher Department Head	LEP meetings	Classroom assessments.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%	62%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with disabilities scoring as proficient not making learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities in this inclusion model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%	78%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who have a low socioeconomic status complete less homework projects than their peers, which is detrimental to their learning.	School provides mentors to all students in need of additional support. School also provides all supplies needed.	Principal	Grade point average and FCAT scores.	FCAT Report Card

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
Reading	6-8 Reading Intervention Course - READ 180 Lab	Florida Reading Association	Mary Boisclair - (Reading Instructor) Della Lowe - (Reading Instructor)	3 day conf. to the Florida Reading Association in Orlando, Florida Oct. 18, 19, 20. 2012	Written response report on how we are implementing this in our classroom.	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal) Jamie Bailey (Human Resources/ Prof Dev.)
Reading Writing Civics	6-8 Language Arts	Core Connections 3210 W. San Juan St Tampa, FL 33629	All language arts instructors	August 13th: Intro to Common Core & FCAT Writing	November 7th: Follow-up workshop #1 January 15th: Follow-up Workshop #2 (ELA only)	Kylie Gannon (Department Head) Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida Reading Conference	Reading Strategies	Title II	\$398.00
			Subtotal: \$398.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data

No Data

No Data

\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$398.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 28%(324) Level 3,4,5 - 77%(618)	Level 3 - 30% Level 3,4,5 - 79%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics 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				

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 40% (294) Level 3,4,5 - 77% (618)	Level 4,5 - 41% Level 3,4,5 - 78%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students above proficient scoring a level 4 or 5 stagnate within a heterogenous class.	Advanced courses in: language arts mathematics science Gifted History Honors courses in: Algebra Geometry High School courses in: Speech Career Prep and Tech SpanishI	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of yearly FCAT scores.	FCAT End of Course Exams

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (455)	72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%	74%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the lowest quartile may be significantly behind their peers who are at or above proficient levels.	Students from our lowest quartile will be scheduled into intervention courses and/or individual intensive reading courses depending upon level.	Guidance Counselor Principal	All students from our lowest quartile will have intensive reading instruction either as a stand alone class, as part of the fusion model, or through a Content Area Reading class.	Examine FCAT results and school wide student schedules to check accuracy of student

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%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	84	86	87	89	90	

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian 92%(17) Hispanic 73%(89) Black 40%(19) White 81%(412)	Asian 93% Hispanic 81% Black 68% White 88%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or
--	---

Mathematics Goal #5C:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%	61%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the ELL program may score lower than their peers of the same knowledge level.	Short and extended response testing instead of multiple choice exams.	Classroom Teacher Department Head	LEP meetings	Classroom assessments.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%	64%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with disabilities scoring as proficient not making learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities in this inclusion model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%	78%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who have a low socioeconomic status complete less homework projects than their peers, which is detrimental to their learning.	School provides mentors to all students in need of additional support. School also provides all supplies needed.	Principal	Grade point average and FCAT scores.	FCAT Report Card

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 46%(48) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(104)	Level 3 - 50% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 54%(56) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(104)	Level 4,5 - 58% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students above proficient scoring a level 4 or 5 stagnate within a heterogenous class.	Advanced courses in: language arts mathematics science Gifted History Honors courses in: Algebra Geometry High School courses in: Speech Career Prep and Tech SpanishI	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of yearly FCAT scores.	FCAT End of Course Exams

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 # <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
1	Students in the ELL program may score lower than their peers of the same knowledge level.	Short and extended response testing instead of multiple choice exams.	Classroom Teacher Department Head	LEP meetings	Classroom assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
1	Students with disabilities scoring as proficient not making learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities in this inclusion model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%	78%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who have a low socioeconomic status complete less homework projects than their peers, which is detrimental to their learning.	School provides mentors to all students in need of additional support. School also provides all supplies needed.	Principal	Grade point average and FCAT scores.	FCAT Report Card

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in 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
	Students above proficient scoring a level 4 or 5 stagnate	Advanced courses in: language arts mathematics	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of yearly FCAT scores.	FCAT End of Course Exams

1	within a heterogenous class.	science Gifted History Honors courses in: Algebra Geometry High School courses in: Speech Career Prep and Tech SpanishI			
---	------------------------------	---	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the ELL program may score lower than their peers of the same knowledge level.	Short and extended response testing instead of multiple choice exams.	Classroom Teacher Department Head	LEP meetings	Classroom assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
1	Students with disabilities scoring as proficient not making learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities in this inclusion model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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
	Students who have a low socioeconomic	School provides mentors to all students	Principal	Grade point average and FCAT scores.	FCAT Report Card

1	status complete less homework projects than their peers, which is detrimental to their learning.	in need of additional support. School also provides all supplies needed.		
---	--	--	--	--

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
LEARN Testing Components	8th/ Algebra & Geometry	Sarasota County Schools	Stacey Brebaugh (instructor) Don Miller (instructor) Kevin Corwin (instructor) David Sellars (instructor)	October 26th 9 AM - 4 PM	Math Department Meeting 11/6	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal) Kevin Corwin (Math Dept. Head)
KAGAN	Classroom Management	Sarasota County Schools	Francesca Turner (instructor)	October 26th	Lesson Plans, Behavior Plans, Math Department Meetings	Kevin Corwin (Math Dept. Head)
PDA - ESE Assessment	All subjects (ESE)	Sarasota County Schools	Don Miller (instructor) Kevin Corwin (instructor)	9/11, 10/2 with web-enhancement for 60 hours total	10/30 Session	Kevin Corwin (math Dept. Head)
LEARN Basic Training	All subjects	Sarasota County Schools	Kevin Corwin (instructor) Stacey Brebaugh (instructor) Karla Specht (instructor)	Summer Session	Assessment Math Department Meetings	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal) Kevin Corwin (Math Dept. Head)
Very Best Treatments for ADHD & The Processing Disorders	All subjects (ESE)	Premier Education Solutions Inc.	Georgia Plath (ESE Liaison)	12/12	Department Meeting	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Very Best Treatments for ADHD & The Processing Disorders	Workshop	Title II	\$189.00
			Subtotal: \$189.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.

\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$189.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science 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 science. Science Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 50% (116) Level 3,4,5 - 70% (164)	Level 3 - 54% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science 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				

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 science. Science Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 21% (48) Level 3,4,5 - 70% (164)	Level 4,5 - 25% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students above proficient scoring a level 4 or 5 stagnate within a heterogenous class.	Advanced courses in: language arts mathematics science Gifted History Honors courses in: Algebra Geometry High School courses in: Speech Career Prep and Tech SpanishI	Principal Assistant Principal	Review of yearly FCAT scores.	FCAT End of Course Exams

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 science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Common Core: Reading Writing Civics Science	6-8 Science	Core Connections 3210 W. San Juan St Tampa, FL 33629	All science instructors	August 13th: Intro to Common Core & FCAT Writing	November 7th: Follow-up workshop #1 January 15th: Follow-up Workshop #2 (ELA only)	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)
GLOBE Project GLOBE Certification Training	6-8 Earth, Life, and Physical Science	GLOBE Research Project Boulder, CO	Eric Bailey Julia Calderon Miles Digati Carlos Hernandez Sara Kuhar Lauren Watson	July 6-July 13 September 22	Meeting once a month Science Department Meeting 10/15	Tara Tahmosh, Principal Carlos Hernandez, Science Dept Head

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
96%(227)	96%

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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
Reading Writing Civics Science	6-8 Language Arts	Core Connections 3210 W. San Juan St Tampa, FL 33629	All language arts instructors	August 13th: Intro to Common Core & FCAT Writing	November 7th: Follow-up workshop #1 January 15th: Follow-up Workshop #2 (ELA only)	Kylie Gannon (Department Head) Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core and FCAT Writing Training Workshop	Common Core writing for all core teachers; FCAT writing for all language arts and ESE teachers.	Title II	\$2,250.00
			Subtotal: \$2,250.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,250.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics 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 Civics. Civics 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
1	Students scoring as proficient are scheduled into heterogenous classes slowing learning gains.	Teachers will utilize the differentiated instruction model to better meet the needs of the above proficient students in this heterogeneous model classroom.	Principal and assistant principal Department Heads	Lesson plans will be reviewed by department heads to ensure differentiated instructional processes are utilized on assessments.	Differentiated instruction will be evident in both lesson plans and in classroom observations.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core: Reading Writing Civics Science	6-8 Social Studies	Core Connections 3210 W. San Juan St Tampa, FL 33629	All Social Studies teachers	August 13th: Intro to Common Core & FCAT Writing	November 7th: Follow-up workshop #1 January 15th: Follow-up Workshop #2 (ELA only)	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)
NGSSS Civics Standards for Florida	7th Grade/Civics	Lou Frey Institute of Politics and Government at UCF and the Florida Joint Center for Citizenship Online	Liz Smith (Civics Instructor)	Open enrollment and completion until July 2012	Department Meetings	Department Head

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Civics 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:	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more</p>
---	--

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease . ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
--------------------------------------	---

2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
-------------------------------	--------------------------------

95% (746/785)	95%
---------------	-----

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

330	299
-----	-----

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

not available	not available
---------------	---------------

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	Parent support	Contract commitments signed by students and parents addresses requirements for being in school and being on time to school. Letters are automatically sent starting this year when attendance patterns and tardy patterns first appear.	Carl Williams, Assistant Principal Michael Reed, Attendance Officer	Review data every 4 weeks	County records

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$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:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

181	142
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
93	75

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students missing school for out-of-school suspensions miss critical instruction.	We will be utilizing an in-school suspension program as needed.	Mr. Carl Williams, Assistant Principal	Data will be examined at the end of the school year	County reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$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

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:		Increase parent volunteer hours by 10%			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
3,215.50 hours		3,537 hours			
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	Increase parent involvement through required volunteer hours and attendance at PTSS meetings	1. Parents of two-member households are required by contract commitment to volunteer 10 hours per school year. Parents of one-member households are required to volunteer 5 hours per school year. These will be closely monitored this year for the first time. 2. Attendance at all PTSS meetings is required for each family. Attendance will be closely monitored this year for the first time.	1. PTSS and administration 2. PTSS and administration	Records will be monitored in both areas throughout the school year and letters will be sent to those in violation.	1. Volunteer hour records 2. Attendance records
2	Increase communication with parents about all aspects of SSA+S	Ed Line will be used by all staff	Each teacher	Parent feedback on climate survey	Climate survey

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 budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No budget is needed for this goal.			\$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:		SSA+S incorporate STEM experiences for 100% (245) of our eighth grade students to focus on awareness of various science careers in the Science, Technology, and Mathematics fields through science fair, career ed, and partnerships.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
GLOBE Training	Science department trained for a week at GLOBE in Colorado.	GLOBE Grant	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$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:	100% (245) of 8th grade students will complete CHOICES online. Small groups will then meet to correlate clusters with career goals.
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
Career Development	6-8	Florida School Counselor Association	Mike Mapes (Guidance Counselor)	11/1-11/3	Presentation to the Social Studies Department	Tara Tahmosh-Newell (Principal)

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida School Counselor Association	Conference	Title II	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$150.00

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
Reading	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
CELLA	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Mathematics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Science	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Writing	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Civics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Attendance	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Suspension	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
STEM	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
CTE	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
CELLA	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Mathematics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Science	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Writing	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Civics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Attendance	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Suspension	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
STEM	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
CTE	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Reading	Florida Reading Conference	Reading Strategies	Title II	\$398.00
CELLA	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Mathematics	Very Best Treatments for ADHD & The Processing Disorders	Workshop	Title II	\$189.00
Science	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Writing	Common Core and FCAT Writing Training Workshop	Common Core writing for all core teachers; FCAT writing for all language arts and ESE teachers.	Title II	\$2,250.00
Civics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Attendance	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Suspension	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No budget is needed for this goal.			\$0.00
STEM	GLOBE Training	Science department trained for a week at GLOBE in Colorado.	GLOBE Grant	\$0.00
CTE	Florida School Counselor Association	Conference	Title II	\$150.00
				Subtotal: \$2,987.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Mathematics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Science	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Writing	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Civics	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
Attendance	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
STEM	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
CTE	No funding is required for the 2012-13 school year.			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$2,987.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

As a charter school, our school advisory council is comprised of our board of directors.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
	\$0.00

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

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

Sarasota School District SARASOTA SCHOOL OF ARTS/SCIENCES 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	91%	99%	76%	356	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	74%	80%			154	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	76% (YES)	80% (YES)			156	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					666	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District SARASOTA SCHOOL OF ARTS/SCIENCES 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	86%	87%	97%	72%	342	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	79%			149	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	79% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					631	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested