

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Pam Stewart, Commissioner  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: HOLMES COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Holmes

Principal: Eddie Dixon

SAC Chair: Eddie Sims

Superintendent: Eddie Dixon

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 12/7/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Eddie Dixon	M. S. in Social Science Education; B.S. in Political Science	4	4	2011-2012 - Reading mastery 55%; Math mastery 58%; Writing mastery 92% 2010-2011 School Grade increased from D to C. Reading mastery 52%; Math mastery 81%; Science mastery 43%; 2009-2010 Reading mastery 51%; Math mastery 71%; Science Mastery 50%; 2008-2009 Grade D. Reading mastery: 56%, Math mastery: 74%; Science mastery 49%; AVP 74%
Assis Principal	Ron Dixon	B.A. in Physical Education; M.A. in Educational Leadership	22	8	2011-2012 Reading mastery 55%; Math mastery 58%; Writing mastery 92% 2010-2011 School Grade increased from D to C. Reading mastery 52%; Math mastery 81%; Science mastery 43%; 2009-2010 Reading mastery 51%; Math mastery 71%; Science Mastery 50%; 2008-2009: Grade D. Reading mastery: 56%, Math mastery: 74%, Science mastery: 49%. AYP: 74% 2007-2008: Grade B. Reading mastery: 53%, Math



36	2.8%(1)	19.4%(7)	27.8%(10)	50.0%(18)	38.9%(14)	86.1%(31)	16.7%(6)	5.6%(2)	0.0%(0)
----	---------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	---------	---------

## 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
Rebecca Motley, Social Studies Department Chair	Larry Skinner	Mentor has over 30 years of successful teaching experience.	Formal and informal meetings throughout the year to address items to help acclimate Mr. Skinner to the school and it's practices.

## 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 funds provide funding and support for professional development activities, parent involvement activities, technology needs, SES services, etc.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

Title I part D to provide the local institution for neglected and or delinquent children, and to at risk students services that are comparable to those provided to children in Title I schools such as : computer assisted instruction, drop out prevention program, mentors career exploration etc.

Title II

Title II part A to provide on-going in-service and professional development/training to assist teachers and paraprofessionals at all levels in meeting the requirements needed to become highly qualified and professional development in areas such as differentiated accountability, learning communities, team teaching, data analysis, math, reading, writing etc. Professional development activities and workshops are coordinated with Title II, Part A.

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

Funds are directed by the district office to provide funding to assist identified homeless students with school supplies, medical care, and tutoring opportunities.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction funds are used to assist in funding our Summer School program.

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Free and reduced-price lunches are provided to qualifying students. HCHS does not participate in free breakfast.

Housing Programs

NA

#### Head Start

NA

#### Adult Education

NA

#### Career and Technical Education

HCHS students participate in the dual-enrollment program at Chipola College. HCHS offers the following career/technical education programs: Agriculture, Business, and Culinary Arts. In addition, students may participate in other technical courses at the Washington-Holmes Technical Center.

#### Job Training

HCHS students participate in the DCT Program offered through Washington-Holmes Technical Center. Students regularly meet with the DCT Coordinator for job coaching.

#### Other

All stakeholders benefit from the collaboration of these programs. The idea is to eliminate gaps in service for all students being served and provide an arena for sharing information and gearing available services to maximize both fiscal and human service efficiency. This helps increase the effectiveness of the research based instructional programs for all eligible students. These services will be limited to research-based best practices providing supplemental support designed to meet individual needs through continuous dialogue, collaboration of services and assessment analysis.

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessments of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as support facilitation.

Reading Coach: Provides guidance on Reading Plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Guidance Counselor: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation.

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

The team meets quarterly to review screening data such as FAIR results, FCAT Testing results, etc.

The team will meet as necessary to review specific students and determine Tier 1 and 2 interventions and efficacy.

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 met to discuss the data collected for the targeting of school improvement needs. The team explained the RTI process and the academic, social, and emotional areas that needed to be addressed.

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.

Progress monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN); Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR); Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district MTSS/RtI director and the guidance department will train staff to assist teachers in implementation. Training will continue throughout the school year as needed per the district implementation plan.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Training will be provided throughout the school year by district staff and the guidance department to support successful implementation of MTSS in our school.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will consist of a teacher from each content and vocational area as well as the Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor, Curriculum Coordinator, and Media Specialist.

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

The school-based LLT works to create a culture of literacy throughout our school. The team meets monthly to review current research, identify the status of our school through data study, and to create school-wide initiatives to promote the culture of literacy. Members serve as a liaison to their departmental teams and grade level teams.

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

The LLT initiative this year will be to address the needs of the lowest 25% of students and the economically disadvantaged students in the school. The LLT will also begin incorporating common core standards.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/3/2012)

## \*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.

Elective and content area teachers, with assistance from the reading coach, will use pre-reading strategies to activate prior knowledge, review vocabulary, and identify the purpose for reading. They will utilize reading strategies during reading to clarify, visualize, infer, and build connections. After reading strategies will deepen understanding, summarize, and reflect content. Students will have access to fiction and non-fiction leveled libraries that will extend the content curriculum and provide opportunities for independent reading.

## \*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?

HCHS has 2 programs in which students may receive Industry Certification. Our business program allows students to earn Microsoft certifications and our Culinary program offers certification in Pro-Star. In addition, students are provided the opportunity to be dually enrolled at either Chipola College or Washington Holmes Technical Center to further their coursework.

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?

Students are given a copy of their cumulative grades, a school curriculum/scheduling guide, graduation requirements, and course selection sheet in small group settings in the spring of the year by the Curriculum Coordinator. The coordinator reviews graduation requirements, bright futures requirements, and course availability with students. Students are given the opportunity to make their course selections, discuss selections with their parents, and meet individually with the curriculum coordinator or guidance counselor to make final course selections. The school master schedule is created based on student course requests each year. Students are also given opportunities to visit local colleges and attend career days.

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

The Holmes County High School (HCHS) High School Feedback Report indicates that HCHS is above state average on many indicators. However, HCHS is below state average on: percent of graduates who completed at least one AP, IB, AICE, or Dual Enrollment course; percent of students enrolled in Algebra I or equivalent prior to 9th grade; percent of graduates who completed at least one level 3 high school math course.

In 2009-2010 HCHS re-implemented the policy of students remaining with the same homeroom teacher during their high school career. These homeroom teachers will be charged with developing and maintaining a rapport with students in include discussions of course selections and post-secondary plans. Homeroom teachers will maintain academic records on their students and routinely discuss bright futures requirements including the need to complete college prep curriculum.

Advance Placement: AP US History began being offered in 2009/10, AP Chemistry was added in 2010/11; AP Biology in 2011/12, and AP Calculus in 2012/13.

2011 - 2012: Holmes County School District has contracted with The College Board to provide PSAT Testing to all 9th and 11th grade students (PLAN Testing for 10th Grade). Data from these tests will be used to discuss future goals with students as well as to plan and implement needed courses of study.

Curriculum maps for Science were revised to offer more science classes for 9th grade students in order to prepare them for level 3 science coursework.

## 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:	65% (141) of 9th and 10th grade students will meet high standards in Reading as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% met high standards in reading	65% (141) will meet high standards

#### 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	Only Level 1 and 2 students are enrolled in reading classes.	HCHS will utilize Thinklink testing to monitor all 9th and 10th grade students' reading skills. FAIR Testing for level 1 and 2 students. The use of benchmark assessments is a scientifically based strategy.	Curriculum Coordinator; 9th grade Reading Teachers and English teachers; 10th Grade English Teacher Reading Coach	Review Thinklink scores and FAIR scores to ensure that teachers are teaching and assessing benchmarks based on scientific researched standards	Thinklink FCAT FAIR

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:				
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:

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:		65% (141) students will make learning gains in reading as evidenced on 2013 FCAT.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
60% made learning gains		65% (141) will make learning gains		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
		Person or	Process Used to	



	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students below grade level in reading	Teachers will target these students by highlighting them in their gradebook to note their progress and to monitor their progress.	Reading Coach Classroom teachers	Review Thinklink and FAIR scores to ensure that teachers are teaching and assessing benchmarks based on scientific researched standards.	Thinklink FAIR FCAT

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

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:	50% (27) of the Lowest 25% of students will make learning gains in Reading as evidenced on 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains	50% (27) of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains

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 below grade level in reading	All level 1 and 2 (disfluent) students will be placed in a block intensive reading class with a reading endorsed teacher. All level 1 and 2 (fluent) students will be placed in an intensive reading class with a reading endorsed teacher. Classes will	Reading Coach; Reading Teachers	Thinklink; FAIR assessments; classroom assessments	Thinklink FAIR FCAT

	receive systematic, explicit reading instruction.		
--	---	--	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55%	63	67	71	74	

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 percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading in these subgroups will be maintained at 44%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% of students in these subgroups made satisfactory progress in reading.	The percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading in these subgroups will be maintained at 44%.

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 below grade level in reading.	All level 1 and 2 dis-fluent students will be placed in block intensive reading class with a reading endorsed teacher. All other level 1 and 2 students will be placed in a regular intensive reading class with a reading endorsed teacher. Classes will received systematic, explicit reading instruction.	Reading Coach Reading Teachers	Thinklink; FAIR Assessment; Classroom assessments	Thinklink FAIR FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	58% Economically Disadvantaged students will score at or above grade level in reading as evidenced on the 2013 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% of economically disadvantaged students scored at or above grade level	58% of economically disadvantaged students will score at or above grade level.

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 below grade level in reading	Teachers will be given a list of Economically disadvantaged students in order to target and more closely monitor student	Classroom teachers	Review Thinklink and FAIR scores to ensure that teachers are teaching and assessing benchmarks based on scientific researched standards.	Thinklink FAIR FCAT

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
Comprehension Instructional Sequence	6-12	Kevin Smith	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley
College and Career Readiness	6-12	Brian Barnes	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley
Responding to Literature	6-12	Kevin Smith	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

# Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

## High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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%.		Mathematics Goal # 5A : <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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	
---	--



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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	Increase the number of students scoring at level 3 or above by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (46) students scored at level 3 or above	51% (51) students will score at level 3 or above

## 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 are not fully realizing implications of not passing Algebra EOC	Continue to stress the importance of learning Algebra skills as they are taught and asking for additional help as needed during class and before/after school tutoring.	Administration Classroom teachers	Skills tests teacher observation	Algebra EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at level 4 or 5 by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (8)	9% (9)

## 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	Top students take Algebra I in the 8th grade at our feeder middle school, therefore, HCHS student pool consists of lower 75% of students.	Identify students capable of scoring at higher levels and to provide opportunities for enrichment.	Administration Classroom Teacher	Standardized tests Thinklink data	Algebra EOC

# 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:	75% of students will score level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (60) of students that took the Geometry EOC scored in the top two thirds of scores.	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 not realizing the implications of not passing EOC as it relates to graduation.	Stress importance of building solid foundations in mathematics; test taking skills; and ongoing discussions with students regarding graduation requirements	Administration Classroom teachers Guidance office	Teacher-made tests Standardized tests	Geometry EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	30% (24) of students will score level 4 or higher on Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (24) students scored in the top one-third	30% will score level 4 or higher.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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
College and Career Readiness	6-12	Brian Barnes	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley
Unpacking the Common Core in Math	6-12	FL DOE	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.		There will be a 10% increase in the number of students scoring at level 3 or above.			
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
71% (80) scored in the top two-thirds of the Biology EOC.		78% (87) students will score level 3 or above.			
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 are not fully realizing implications of not passing Biology EOC	Continue to stress the importance of learning basic concepts as they are taught and asking for additional help as needed during class	Administration Classroom Teachers	Teacher-made tests Thinklink Testting	Biology EOC

		and before/after school tutoring.		
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.  
Biology Goal #2:

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Interacting with Text Strategies and Common Core	6-12	FL DOE	6-12	Pre-school	Reflection Exercises	Janie Lolley

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	95% of 10th grade students will achieve level 3 and higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% of students achieved Level 3.0 and higher	95% of 10th grade students will score level 3 and higher

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Continue to meet high standards as set by HCHS students	Teachers will administer WOW (Working on Writing) assessments	10th grade English teacher,	WOW scores are compared each year to FCAT Writing scores to ensure that teachers are consistently using writing rubrics that mimic FCAT Writing rubrics.	FCAT Writing Test scores

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0 Writing Scoring/Instructional Implications Training	9th/10th English Teachers	FLDOE	9th Grade English Teacher 10th Grade English Teacher	October 8, 2012	Grading of WOW papers	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

*End of U.S. History EOC Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance		No more than 10% of students will have an excessive number of absences.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
Average Daily Attendance 91%		Average Daily Attendance increase to 95%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
144		75			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
233		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
	Students absent without parental knowledge	1) District implemented a Parent Portal, FOCUS, for parents to monitor their child's attendance and grade data 2) Use of "School Reach" Program to	Assistant Principal, Guidance Secretary, Guidance Counselor, Principal	Review student attendance reports weekly	School attendance reports

1		contact parents when students are absent from school. 3) Personal phone calls from Principal, Assistant Principal, or Guidance Counselor when students are absent 2 or more consecutive days			
2	Students unaware of State attendance policies	Attendance policies are printed in student planners and discussed in homeroom at the beginning of each year.	Homeroom teachers,Principal	Attendance reports	School attendance reports
3	Students do not appear to understand the impact attendance/absenteeismhas on academic performance and the ability to graduate on time.	Staff contact with students to emphasize importance of attendance and to inform them of their status.  Credit recovery opportunities to help get students back on track.	Administration Guidance Counselor Homeroom teachers Attendance Office	Attendance Reports	Attendance Reports Attendance Rate

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	The number of students suspended out of school will decrease by 50%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
3	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
3	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
48	24
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
40	20

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student altercations	Students will be counseled by administrators and/or guidance counselor to resolve conflict.	Principal	Review of Discipline data	Discipline records
2	Possession of prohibited substances	School will participate in activities and programs that educate students on the effects of drug/alcohol abuse and promote substance free lifestyles	Principal	Review of Discipline data	Discipline records
	Lack of student knowledge of school policies	Students will be given District Code of Conduct books and a planner that has school	Principal, Assistant Principal, Homeroom	Review of Discipline data	Discipline records

3		rules included. Homeroom teachers will discuss policies with students. Assemblies will be held to communicate expectations to students	teachers		
4	Inconsistency of teachers enforcing school policies	Whole-group and small group meetings to communicate school policies and procedures to faculty and staff and their responsibility for enforcing rules	Principal	Review of Discipline data	Discipline records data

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention  Dropout Prevention Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	Less than 1% of students will drop-out of high school
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
1.1%	Less than 1%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
75%	85%

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	Drop-outs due to non-attendance	Use School Reach phone system to contact parents when students are absent; personal phone calls to parents; home visits by SRO, Principal, and/or Assistant Principal.	Assistant Principal, Guidance counselor	Review number of drop-outs; review student exit interviews	Drop-out rates; student exit interview
2	Students not on track with credits needed for graduation	Refer students to Graduate Assistance Program to earn credits for graduation  Offer more access to credit recovery courses during the school day	Principal; Guidance Counselor	Review number of drop-outs; review student exit interviews	Drop-out rates; student exit interview

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		40% of parents will be involved in curricular and extra-curricular activities at HCHS			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
30% of parents are involved		40% of parents will be involved			
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	Ineffective communication between school and home	HCHS will utilize the: 1) School Reach program 2) School and District Websites 3) School Marquee to inform parents of school activity dates, testing dates, and dates of student progress being sent	Principal	Review of parental involvement	meeting records, minutes, and parent sign-in sheets

		home 4)Utilize SAC's committee to investigate other ways of communicating with parents.		
--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

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



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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. CTE

CTE Goal #1:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<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.

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/3/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

# 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

Holmes School District HOLMES COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	81%	84%	43%	260	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	53%	68%			121	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?	40% (NO)	50% (YES)			90	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					471	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Holmes School District HOLMES COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	56%	78%	94%	50%	278	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	50%	72%			122	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?	28% (NO)	49% (NO)			77	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					477	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested