FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NORTH PORT HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Mr. David Jones

SAC Chair: Mr. Rich Carney

Superintendent: Ms. Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

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	Mr. David Jones	B.A. -- Colorado State University, Social Sciences M.A. -- M.E. Lesley College Educational Leadership -- University of Colorado Certified National Kagan Trainer Adjunct Professor -- Adams State College, Colorado	1	5	North Port High School in 2010-11 Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science proficiency: 36%, Writing proficiency: 81%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math.
					Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2010-11 Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science proficiency: 36%, Writing proficiency: 81%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math.

Assis Principal	Mr. William Massolio	B.A.-History-University of South Florida; M.A.-Educational Leadership-University of South Florida	6	10	Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2009-10 Reading proficiency: 43%, Math proficiency: 81%, Science proficiency: 29%, Writing proficiency: 83%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. 2008-09: Grade: C, Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science Proficiency: 35%, Writing Proficiency: 79%. AYP: 79%, No subgroups made AYP in Reading; the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency 46%, Math Proficiency 76%, Science Proficiency 38%, Writing Proficiency 79%. AYP 74%, No subgroups made AYP in Reading; the Black, Hispanic and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math.
Assis Principal	Mr. Paul Paquette	BA- University of Wisconsin-Lacrosse: Bachelor of Science-Physical Education & Health Education National-Louis. University: Master of Education Educational Leadership And Supervision. State of Florida Certifications: Physical Education K-12, Health Education 6-12 Administration Supervision/ Educational Leadership K-12. ESOL Certified, Preparing New Principals Certification, Certificate of Completion of Reasonable Suspicion Testing Training.	11	11	Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2010-11 Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science proficiency: 36%, Writing proficiency: 81%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2009-2010 Reading proficiency: 43%, Math proficiency: 81%, Science proficiency: 29%, Writing proficiency: 83%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: C, Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science Proficiency: 35%, Writing Proficiency: 79%. AYP: 79%, No subgroups made AYP in reading; the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency 46%, Math Proficiency 76%, Science Proficiency 38%, Writing Proficiency 79%. AYP 74%, No subgroups made AYP in Reading; the Black, Hispanic and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math.
Assis Principal	Mr. Ron Corso	BA Degree- Barry University; MS Degree Exceptional Student Education; Educational Leadership Certification; Graduate of the Sarasota Leadership Academy; Principal Certification-State of Florida. Graduate of the PNP program of Sarasota School District	9	6	Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2010-11 Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science proficiency: 36%, Writing proficiency: 81%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. Assistant Principal of North Port High in 2009-2010 Reading proficiency: 43%, Math proficiency: 81%, Science proficiency: 29%, Writing proficiency: 83%. No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black; low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. 2008-2009: Grade: C, Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science Proficiency: 35%, Writing Proficiency: 79%. AYP: 79%, No subgroups made AYP in reading; the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency 46%, Math Proficiency 76%, Science Proficiency 38%, Writing Proficiency 79%. AYP 74%, No subgroups made AYP in reading; the Black, Hispanic and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math.

| Assis Principal | Mr. Tomas Dinverno | BA Degree— University of Colorado; Spanish and Education MA Degree – University of South Florida; Educational Leadership; Graduate of the Sarasota Leadership Academy; Next Generation Certified. | 8 | 3 | Assistant Principal of North Port High School in 2010-11 Reading proficiency: 46%, Math proficiency: 79%, Science proficiency: 36%, Writing proficiency: 81%, No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black, low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. Administrative Intern of North Port High School in 2009-2010 Reading proficiency: 43%, Math proficiency: 81%, Science proficiency: 29%, Writing proficiency: 83%. No subgroups made AYP in reading, the Black; low SES and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in Math. |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Involving new teachers in at least 1 school wide initiative. Examples include STEM SLC, Attendance Committee, District Science Fair, Literacy Team 2. Regular meetings with new teachers 3. Mentoring program for new teachers with trained mentors on staff	Assistant Principals Principal Lead Mentor/ Assistant Principals	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
1 Instructional Staff Mr. William Huthman out of field in ESE Science		Provide a mentor for teacher. Work with ESE Department for support as well as training towards his completion of ESE credentials.

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
128	9.4%(12)	23.4%(30)	58.6%(75)	8.6%(11)	82.8%(106)	0.0%(0)	14.1%(18)	4.7%(6)	16.4%(21)

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
Reich, Don	Arzuza, Karla	Same side of campus and share a pd off	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Harris, Vickie	Geiger, Claire	Share same lunch and planning	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Thomas, Lee	Kayser, Adria	Both in Guidance	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Reich, Ileana	Kurtz, Karla	Same side of campus and did share a pd	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Hogue, Deb	McGucken, Courtney	Same dept, building and lunch	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Caruso, Marilyn	Murdocca, Pasquale	Same lunch, both elective teacher	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Rhoten, Nancy	Spindler, Bonnie	Flexible help time from Nancy and both support personnel	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.
Stringer, Jennifer	Jakoby, Ken	Same lunch and planning	The mentor and mentee meet biweekly in a professional learning community to discuss school improvement goals. Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

North Port High School has been allocated $10,000 in funding from Title II. This will be used for curriculum related professional development training, including conference registration for teachers that attend trainings related to the content they teach. Assistant Principal Tomas Dinverno is the contact for Title II funds at the school.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based MTSS Leadership team is comprised of the school guidance counselors, school social worker, school psychologist, School nurse, school attendance worker, school principal, ESE Liaison, ESOL Coordinator and Performance-Based Diploma Coordinator:
Guidance Chair: Provides leadership and allocates resources for the group. The Guidance Counselors: Provides information about individual students and they are responsible to stay in contact with student families and to set up parent meetings.
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Provides information about ESE students and to help to guide the team when ESE interventions and testing are necessary.
School Nurse: Provides appropriate health information and concerns regarding medical or potential medical issues.
Classroom Teachers: Classroom teachers will provide information to guide instruction and academic interventions for struggling students.
School Psychologist: Provides information about mental health and testing resources available.
School Attendance Worker: Provides information about students who are truant and serves as a liaison between the school and families involved with court issues for non-attendance of school.
School Social Worker: Provides information about resources and support for students and families, acts as a liaison between families and the school, and is available to make home visits as needed.
ESOL Coordinator: Provides information about students whose second language is English, acts as a liaison with ESOL parents, and translates or makes arrangements for translators for parent-teacher conferences as needed.
Performance-Based Diploma Coordinator: Provides information about mental health and testing resources available.
School Psychologist: Provides information about high-risk students and resources available through the PBD program.

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 MTSS team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: The team will review summative and formative data to identify school, grade, SLC, and class level academic needs. Individual student information will be reviewed. Based on the data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed. Student progress will be monitored and individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions. For those students who require additional resources or testing, the team will direct services to them.

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 school-based MTSS Leadership Team will employ continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the SLC teams, the SAC and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional need.
On a monthly basis, DBLT in collaboration with SBLT will oversee the implementation of the SIP Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

The school uses a variety of reports produced by the district Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, mathematics, science and writing is utilized. Further, the school will participate in the FAIR Reading assessment and utilize the Florida Achieves Mathematics and Science assessments to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The administrative team received training on the MTSS model during district leadership sessions in the summer of 2011. The training included staff materials for distribution during the fall of the 2011 school year. In addition, the professional development coordinator for the school has planned MTSS trainings during the fall and spring semesters for instructional staff. This will include district level trainers, such as the ESE specialist and Reading specialist, to offer professional development in the use of the MTSS model.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS team will have represenation from several areas within the school so that a network of support is established. Continual feedback using the Florida Implementation model will allow for communication about attendance, graduation requirements, discipline, and guidance concerns to be effectively completed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of content area teachers across all disciplines, as well as the Media Specialist and an Assistant Principal. Members include Beth Taylor, Don Reich, Kristi Alexander, Kate Rogers-Giuffre, Vicki Jones and Tomas Dinverno.

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

The LLT meets twice monthly to plan proffesional development, discuss the action plan, and reflect on the steps taken toward the action plan. Each member is responsbile to discuss Literacy at Department meetings, and to promote PD to staff.

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

Three major initiatives are the focus of the LLT this school year:

1. Promote Literacy at the school via Professional Development and School Wide Literacy initiatives such as 1 Book 1 School.
2. Provide Department strategies and trainings on Content Area Reading Strategies. LLT will focus on best practices from Common Core standards as learned from summer conference. These include text complexity, summarizing, evidence based reading/writing.
3. Implement Research Based processes in content areas using Virtual Learning tools.

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.

Professional development for all staff members at NPHS includes reading comprehension strategies. These include high order questioning techniques, vocabulary building strategies, and summarizing text structure. Teachers collaborate in their Professional Learning Community to share instructional strategies within and across disciplines. Vocabulary generated within the English Department is shared school wide in order to compile a list of essential FCAT words that all teachers can reinforce regardless of content area. Strategy of the month trainings allow teachers to gain further understanding in the application of reading strategies throughout the school year.

*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?

We offer several (CTE) course at NPHS related to a specific fields such as Commercial Foods, Intro to Information Technology, Digital Design, PC Support, Web Design, Criminal Justice, Drafting, Construction, Health Science, and Early Childhood that give students opportunities to learn and have hand-on experiences.

The Science/Technology/Engineering/Math small learning community will be implemented in 2011-12 with the emphasis on integrating these subjects using a team teaching approach focused on applied engineering.

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?

Counselors meet with students one on one to discuss their academic and career goals and work out a schedule to help them meet those goals. Teachers have discussions with students, recommending them for appropriate classes. The program of studies and a list of career websites are available to students to research on the school's website. Students complete a personalized Epep to assist them with planning their academic courses throughout high school. Career advising through work values and interest surveys allow students to prepare for their future following high school and explore career opportunities. Seniors are able to take an executive intern class that prepares them for a professional working environment and helps them explore career interests in a hands-on environment. Students participate in mock interviews, résumé building workshops and job shadowing throughout the course.

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

Students at North Port High School are provided a variety of experiences throughout their high school career to ensure that students are prepared for postsecondary plans. School counselors encourage students to take Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and honors classes by promoting these programs to students during conferences throughout the school year and during registration each spring. Students are also identified as
potential AP students based on PSAT scores and a letter is sent home to parents listing available AP courses for these students. By participating in the AP and DE programs, students are provided the opportunity to earn college credit while still attending high school. Students are also provided the opportunity to participate in several Career Technical programs at NPHS or at Sarasota County Technical Institute to prepare students for future careers. Approximately 60 students each year participate in internships with businesses in the community, providing them with experience in various career fields. Students who are interested in possibly entering the military after graduation are provided with opportunities to meet with recruiters who visit the campus several times each year. Each student is scheduled to speak with a school counselor regarding course selection and their postsecondary plans each spring. Students with disabilities meet with a liaison during their senior year to establish a post-secondary plan. Students who speak English as their other language meet with school's ESOL liaison during their senior year to establish a plan after high school with the assistance of a school counselor. Guidance staff encourages students to participate in taking the ACT, SAT and/or CPT exams during their junior year. The guidance department hosts a junior and senior parent night annually where information is communicated to parents and students about planning for postsecondary education. Handouts are distributed during these meetings giving additional information on resources and opportunities for students. A senior newsletter is provided to all seniors throughout the year with important information that helps them plan for their next academic step. Members of the North Port High School community are also able to gather information regarding scholarships, financial aid, college requirements, and graduation information from the school's guidance website. Financial Aid Night is scheduled to review information on Bright Futures, scholarships, grants, and loans. College admissions representatives visit the high school regularly and students are able to gather information during these visits regarding a particular college or university that they may be interested in attending. Seniors complete a survey at the end of their senior year giving the school data on their future plans.

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 - 25%(288) Level 3,4,5 - 50%(573)	Level 3 - 29% Level 3,4,5 - 54%

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	Implementation of Instructional Focus Calendar across all English Department	Collaboration within department regarding IFC timeline	English Department and Administration	Monthly department meetings to monitor implementation of IFC	Pride Evaluations and Classroom Walkthrough
2	Students have a lack of knowledge with literacy strategies, vocabulary strategies, and answering higher order questions.	Provide PD to teachers in the areas reading strategies, vocabulary implementation and creation of higher level questions	Administration, school and district personnel	Evaluate the use of strategies used within the classroom via classroom walk-through	PRIDE (teacher evaluation program) & CWT (classroom walkthrough data by administration
3	Lack of knowledge when using progress monitoring tools to differentiate instruction	Evaluate FAIR and/or FOCUS assessments to monitor student progress	Test Coordinator/ Administration/ Teachers	Monitor student growth between FAIR AP1-AP3, and FOCUS assessments	Print out of FAIR & FOCUS reports
4	Monitoring formative and summative assessments for students and providing timely feedback	Utilize progress monitoring tools to effectively track student progress	Teachers/Department Chairs/Data Coach/Administration	Access the benchmark results for courses using progress monitoring tools	Standardized assessment results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
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	Maintaining a student at a level 4/5 reading level from 8th-9th or 9th-10th grade, and helping a student move up an FCAT level from 1 grade to the next	Identify the student % within specific classes that either increase, decrease, or stay the same with the FCAT level from one year to the next and planning for areas to enhance reading	Teacher, Data Coach, Administration	Teachers receive data in pre-service workshop and collaborate with data coach to determine percentages of students and best practices for aiding student growth at upper FCAT level	FCAT 2012-13 data of students with lvl 4/5
2	Student engagement with independent reading, especially informational text	Allow students independent reading time	Teachers and Administration	Monitoring direct instruction and focused reading time. Teacher includes independent reading time in lesson plan.	Florida Reading Intervention Protocol used during CWT

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 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 - 25%(285) Level 3,4,5 - 50%(573)	Level 4,5 -27% Level 3,4,5 - 54%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge with literacy strategies, vocabulary strategies, and use of creating higher order questions	Provide PD in the areas reading strategies, vocabulary implementation and creation of higher level questions	Administration, school and district personnel	Evaluate the use of strategies used within the classroom via classroom walk-through	PRIDE & CWT
2	Implementation of Instructional Focus Calendar across all English Department	Collaboration within department regarding IFC timeline	English Department and Administration	Monthly department meetings to monitor implementation of IFC	Pride Evaluations and Classroom Walkthrough

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Incorporating Tier II and Tier III interventions into weekly instruction	Use of PLC time to access and evaluate student formative assessment results to help plan RTI	Teacher, Data Coach, Administration	Use ongoing student results to differentiate instruction in class lesson	Increase of student achievement from AP 1 to AP2/3

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:
59%(593)	63%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge with literacy strategies, vocabulary strategies, and use of creating higher order questions	Provide PD in the areas reading strategies, vocabulary implementation and creation of higher level questions	Administration, school and district personnel	Evaluate the use of strategies used within the classroom via classroom walk-through	PRIDE & CWT
2	Monitoring formative and summative assessments for students and providing timely feedback	Utilize progress monitoring tools to effectively track student progress	Teachers/Department Chairs/Data Coach/Administration	Access the benchmark results for courses using progress monitoring tools	Standardized assessment results

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

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
	Student engagement	Allow students	Teachers and	Monitoring direct	Florida Reading

1	with independent reading, especially informational text.	independent reading time	Administration	instruction and focused reading time. Teacher includes independent reading time in lesson plan.	Intervention Protocol used during CWT

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:
60%(152)	64%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Feedback to students regarding progress towards reading proficiency	Specific guided instruction for lowest achieving readers during 90 minute instruction	Teacher and Administration	Teachers monitor student reading and provide TIER 2 or TIER 3 interventions.	Teacher documentation in lesson plan and PLC notes reviewed by Administration
2	Evaluation of teachers across subjects and grade levels	Observe core classes between FAIR I and FAIR II, focusing on English/Math	Administration	September to December class visits	Long Form of PRIDE
3	Attendance	Implementation of the school attendance policy.	Teachers and Administration	Monitor the number of absences from month to month	Attendance Report
4	Monitoring formative and summative assessments for students and providing timely feedback	Utilize progress monitoring tools to effectively track student progress	Teachers/Department Chairs/Data Coach/Administration	Access the benchmark results for courses using progress monitoring tools	Standardized assessment results

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 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55	59	63	67	71	

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 2012-1013 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:

White 57%(442)
Hispanic 43%(50)
Black 36%(42)

White 63%
Hispanic 55%
Black 43%

	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 understanding their areas to improve	FCAT data discussions in Advisory	Advisory teachers / Data coach / ESE Liaison	Monthly advisory meetings, advisory teacher retains copy of data sheet as well as sending copy home	Number of data discussions and FCAT proficiency level on 2011 assessment
2	Incorporating Tier II and Tier III interventions into weekly instruction	Use of PLC time to access and evaluate student formative assessment results to help plan RTI	Teacher, Data Coach, Administration	Use ongoing student results to differentiate instruction in class lesson	Increase of student achievement from AP 1 to AP2/3
3	Attendance	Implementation of the school attendance policy.	Teachers and Administration	Monitor the number of absences from month to month	Attendance Report
4	Monitoring formative and summative assessments for students and providing timely feedback	Utilize progress monitoring tools to effectively track student progress	Teachers/Department Chairs/Data Coach/Administration	Access the benchmark results for courses using progress monitoring tools	Standardized assessment results

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	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:
20%	36%

	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 need extra assistance with learning reading skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Teachers/ Department Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments including FAIR I, FAIR II, III
2	Monitoring students exiting ESOL programs	Teacher feedback and review by ESOL coordinator	ESOL Coordinator	Ongoing progress monitoring	Number of students in ESOL and FCAT scores of students exited from ESOL within 2 year window
3	Students understanding their areas to improve	FCAT data discussions in Advisory	Advisory teachers / Data coach / ESE Liaison	Monthly advisory meetings, advisory teacher retains copy of data sheet as well as sending copy home	Number of data discussions and FCAT proficiency level on 2012 assessment

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:
18%	38%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students understanding their areas to improve	District benchmark progress monitoring updates with students and Reading FCAT data discussions in Advisory	Advisory teachers / Data coach / ESE Liaison	Monthly advisory meetings, advisory teacher retains copy of data sheet as well as sending copy home	Number of data discussions and FCAT proficiency level on 2011 assessment
2	Students in need of services that are not identified in ESE/ESOL programs	Scheduling students into classes based on IEP and School Wide Support team	Administration, ESE Liaison, School Wide Support Team	Weekly CARE meetings	Number of students identified for receiving services
3	Students understanding their areas to improve	FCAT data discussions in Advisory	Advisory teachers / Data coach / ESE Liaison	Monthly advisory meetings, advisory teacher retains copy of data sheet as well as sending copy home	Number of data discussions and FCAT proficiency level on 2011 assessment

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:
48%	55%

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	Opportunities for tutoring for students outside of school	Weekly Reading Lab free help and Spring FCAT camp offered at NPHS and use of free tutor service supplied by county	Administration / Teacher Volunteers	Use FAIR data to monitor student progress throughout year and offer opportunity for tutoring	FCAT proficiency level on 2011 assessment
2	Opportunities for tutoring for students outside of school	Spring FCAT camp offered at NPHS and use of free tutor service supplied by county	Administration / Teacher Volunteers	Use FAIR data to monitor student progress throughout year and offer opportunity for tutoring	FCAT proficiency level on 2011 assessment

		Attendance	Implementation of the school attendance policy.	Teachers and Administration	Monitor the number of absences from month to month	Attendance Report indicating percentage decrease in number of tardies/absences for this subgroup
3						

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
Literacy & Vocabulary Strategies	All	LLT	All Content Areas	Monthly	Teacher discussions in PLC's and Department meetings, PRIDE evaluations	Administration
FAIR Information	English	Test Coordinator	English	3 times after AP1, 2, 3	Department follow up	Department chair

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Readig Lab	Weekly free tutoring for students to help with Reading	Internal	$1,500.00
		Subtotal: $1,500.00	
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
Instructional Focus Calender	Professional Development for teachers	District funding	$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: $1,500.00			

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
1	Identification of student individual needs and progress monitoring of student assessment	Review student cases based on student progress within program	ESOL Coordinator, ESOL Teachers	Analyzing student data within ESOL framework	CELLA Reports on individual students

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
1	Students understanding their areas to improve	FCAT data discussions in Advisory	Advisory teachers / Data coach / ESE Liaison	Monthly advisory meetings, advisory teacher retains copy of data sheet as well as sending copy home	Number of data discussions and FCAT proficiency level on 2012 assessment

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		
			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	FCAT Writing Scoring for 2013 will include increased attention to the correct use of English conventions.	Training Staff on the changes in the rubric as well as providing instructional strategies for teaching proper use of conventions	ESOL Department, District curriculum staff, Administration	Writing trainings with district specialist. English Department meetings to review scoring rubrics. Teacher scoring of student writing across department.	FCAT Writing scores on 2013 examination

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:

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:	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%(238) Level 3,4,5 - 58%(300)	Level 3 - 50% Level 3,4,5 - 62%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Monitoring formative and summative assessments for students and providing timely feedback	Utilize progress monitoring tools to effectively track student progress	Teachers/Department Chairs/Data Coach/Administration	Access the benchmark results for courses using progress monitoring tools	Standardized assessment results
2	Students need extra assistance with learning math skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Math Teachers/Dept Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments on Learn
3	Use of common assessments on Learn to monitor student progress on benchmark tests	Ongoing professional development for teachers using Angel Web for progress monitoring	Math Department, Data Coach, Administration	Math Department meetings, Quarterly district trainings with Algebra/Geometry teachers	Focus and benchmark assessment numbers used on Learn

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.	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

Algebra Goal #2:	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 - 12%(62) Level 3,4,5 - 58%(300)	Level 4,5 - 16% Level 3,4,5 - 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 lack the ability to answer higher level thinking questions	Implement higher-level thinking questions into weekly lessons	Teachers/PLC groups	Monitor student growth on district benchmark tests, common assessments	Algebra EOC, & FCAT

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

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 school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	59	63	66	70	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:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	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:
Black-54% Hispanic-59% White-72%	Black-57% Hispanic-62% White-63% Exceeded

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 need extra assistance with learning math skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Math Teachers/Dept Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark 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:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population.

satisfactory progress in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #3C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%	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 need extra assistance with learning reading skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Teachers/ Department Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments including FAIR I, FAIR II, III

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:	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:
37%	48%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher professional development on Instructional Strategies for SWD including IFC	Professional Development offered during the school year focusing on SWD	Department / Administration	Teacher attendance at PD offerings	EOC proficiency level of SWD on 2012 assessment

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:
65%	61% 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 need extra assistance with learning math skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Math Teachers/Dept Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments

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
No Data Submitted				

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

Target

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :

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

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need extra assistance with learning reading skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Teachers/ Department Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments including FAIR I, FAIR II, III

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	Teacher professional development on Instructional Strategies for SWD including IFC	Professional Development offered during the school year focusing on SWD	Department / Administration	Teacher attendance at PD offerings	EOC proficiency level of SWD on 2012 assessment

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
1	Students need extra assistance with learning math skills	Provide After school assistance in Math Lab twice a week	Math Teachers/Dept Chair	Evaluate student performance on district benchmark assessments	District benchmark assessments

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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics tutoring for students	Math Lab staffed with certified Math instructors helping students after school	Internal	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
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
Professional Development for Instructional Focus Calendar	IFC training for staff to utilize	District	$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: $2,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.

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

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	
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	Training for teachers regarding Biology EOC test specs	Coordinating with district Science specialist to align school training to EOC	District specialist, science department	Ongoing professional development and implementation of formative assessments in Biology	Biology EOC examination student levels
2	Implementation of new Instructional Focus Calendar and curriculum materials	Provide Professional Development for Biology Teachers	District Program Specialist and Department Chair	Professional Development Rosters and teacher attendance at Department meetings	PD System

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
IFC PD and DI PD	10th	District & Department	Biology Teachers	Fall/Spring	Classroom implementation and Admin observations	Teachers and Administration

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:	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:
83%(480)	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	Cross curricular collaboration with other departments for school wide writing in the curriculum	Teacher collaboration in PLC groups and Department meetings	PLC groups and Department members	Use of Sharepoint to review other PLC plans	2013 FCAT Writing Scores
2	Preparing teachers for evidenced based writing as described in Common Core Standards	Provide teachers with professional development related to writing strategies, focusing on samples from Common Core	Teachers, Department Chairs, Administration	Use of evidence based writing and student samples across curricular areas.	2013 FCAT Writing 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:	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 4.0 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 4.0 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:
34%(194)	35%

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
	FCAT Writing Scoring for 2013 will include increased attention to	Training Staff on the changes in the rubric as well as providing	English Department, District curriculum	Writing trainings with district specialist. English Department	FCAT Writing scores on 2012 examination

1	the correct use of English conventions, therefore more rigorous standards for scoring abouve a level 4.	instructional strategies for teaching proper use of conventions	staff, Administration	meetings to review scoring rubrics. Teacher scoring of student writing across department.	
2	Preparing teachers for evidenced based writing as described in Common Core Standards	Provide teachers with professional development related to writing strategies, focusing on samples from Common Core	Teachers, Department Chairs, Administration	Use of evidence based writing and student samples across curricular areas.	2013 FCAT Writing Scores

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
Review of Writing Rubric	9-12	English Department	Open to all content areas	Ongoing	Peer scoring of student samples	English Department Chair
Literacy Strategies in developing evidenced based writing	9-12	Literacy Team	Open to all content areas	Fall/Spring 2012/13	Content area writing assignments	Departments

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
Literacy Strategies for Writing Across the Curriculum	Professional Development for Content Area Staff to implement writing	Internal PD	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
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
Instructional Focus Calendar	11th/ U.S. History	District	U.S. History teachers	Fall 2012	Department meetings to review IFC ongoing implementation	U.S. History Department chair
Curriculum and Textbook training	11th/ U.S. History	District	U.S. History teachers	Ongoing, starting in Fall 2012	Department meetings and Collaborative Planning Time	U.S. History Department chair

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	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. 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 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:
95.1 % (2420/2545)	97.1%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
1303	1201
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
1	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student absences increasing before interventions to keep student in school are put in place	Maintain an Attendance Committee that will oversee student absences	Attendance Committee	Periodic review of student absence data in coordination with attendance office, AP designee of team, and MTSS team.	Attendance yearly comparison report from AS400

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
Crosspointe Attendance	9-12	Crosspointe Trainers	Instructional staff	Fall 2012	Attendance Team monitors Teacher input of Attendance	Attendance Team

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
Monitoring of student attendance for habitual unexcused absences	School Wide Support Team	School Support Service	$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
158	158
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
120	120
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
274	147
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
191	191

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 attendance and unexcused absences during school day.	Attendance commitee to provide support system and consistent delivery of follow up on early interventions and consequences.	Attendance Committee	Weekly meetings of School Wide support system and periodic Attendance committee meetings.	Referral 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
Tools For Teaching Classroom Management by Fred Jones	9-12	Admin	Instructinal staff	Ongoing 2012-13	Study group participation and change in teaching practice	Admin and Departemnt members

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

	Dropout Goal

	1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	For the School year 2012-2013, there will be a reduction in the percent of students who dropout of school. If the current dropout rate is 2.5 or higher, there will be a .4 percent reduction. If the current dropout rate is less than 2.5, there will be a .2 percent reduction. Graduation Goal For the school year 2012-2013, the percentage of students graduating from high school will increase. If the current graduation rate is less than 84 percent, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point increase for all subgroups. If the current graduation rate is 84 percent or higher, there will be a 2 percentage point increase.

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2.0% (55)	1.8%

2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students behind on thier graduation credits. Students moving to GED program.	Identifying students that are behind credits for their cohort and scheduling into PBD program Follow up with students that transfer to GED program.	Guidance and Registrar	Scheduling with guidance and follow up exit surveys with registrar	AS400 reports on student credits and completion requirements.
2	Monitoring of students at risk of dropout	Focus on 2 Guidance Counselors working only with 12th grade case load	Mrs. Beach, Mr. Thomas	Progress monitoring of 12th grade graduation status with GPA, attendance	2012-13 Dropout rate decrease

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase the amount of Parents attending School Sponsored information nights including Open House, Financial Aid, 11th/12th College Information.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
45% Parent Involvement in School Sponsored Parent Nights	55% Parent Involvement in School Sponsored Parent Nights

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	Increasing participation of evening events	Multiple communication methods including connect ed calls, student hand outs, marquee display, website information.	Guidance and Administration	Follow up phone and online surveys	Connect ed survey and online Surveymonkey

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:	Increase enrollment in STEM Academy courses at the school and continue to raise the achievement level of students completing Industry Certification in the 2 STEM related fields of Health Science and Engineering by 10%. 2012 Enrollment STEM Engineering: 78 STEM Health : 142
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
	Providing teacher training for 2 new staff	Retain and train 2 new staff members for the	CTE Department chair and	ICE Credential obtained by staff during 2012-13	ICE results by staff and

1	in the STEM Academies in order to certify them in ICE for student preparation in the exam.	ICE requirements.	Assistant Principal	school year.	students and enrollment numbers in STEM courses at NPHS.
2	Promotion of STEM program and courses	Develop marketing materials for prospective students and parents. Visit middle schools to present program information.	STEM Academy	Scheduling process	Enrollment increase in 2013-14
3	Partnering with community and business leaders to bring real world project based learning to students	Develop community partners working with STEM Community facilitator	STEM Community Facilitator	Scheduling of community partners	Increase in community partners and real world experiences for students

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
Online CTE trainings as well as District Sponsored STEM professional development	9-12	District / State	STEM Team	Fall/Spring 2012-13	Participant product related to training	Teacher/ Administration
STEM Academy teacher cohort training in specified online FACTE courses	9-12	District / State	STEM Team	Ongoing	Participant product related to training	Teacher / Administration
SolidWorks training	9-10	District	STEM Engineering Teacher	2012-13 School Year	Certification	Teacher

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
Instructional training for CTE teachers	CTE Trainings	District	$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

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:	Increase student achievement in the Industry Certification Exams in each subject area by a minimum of 4%. 2012 rates: Culinary Arts 91% MS Office 93% Criminal Justice 100% Construction 56% MSSC 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	Maintain high levels of student passing rates from 2011-12	Communicate testing dates and pretesting information to CTE teachers. Provide opportunities for professional development.	CTE Department Chair and Assistant Principal.	Professional Development opportunities in district and state level.	ICE results at school level by content area.
2	Students engaged in CTSO and other afterschool CTE organizations	Increase number of students meeting eligibility requirements for National Technical Honor Society by 10%	CTE Teachers, Club sponsors	Promotion of programs	Increase in student numbers in CTE afterschool opportunities
3	Incorporating reading strategies into CTE classes to help student achievement on ICE	Increase CTE teachers will participate in NG-CAR-PD	CTE Teachers and Department Chair	Offer CARPD both at state and district level	Completion of NG-CARPD by CTE teachers

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

Industry Certification Training and Technical Training such as NG-CATER	9-12 CTE courses	District CTE Department, NPHS Department chair	CTE Teachers	Fall, Spring 2012-13	Goals accomplished on Individual Professional Development Plan	Individual Teacher and Administrator
Perkins Professional Development Institute to support teacher industry certification	9-12 CTE	State	CTE Teachers	Ongoing	Teachers submit Perkins grant for PD	Completion of Professional Development

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
Industry Certification professional development for teachers needing to get certification	CTE Budget	Perkins Grants	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Instructional Technology Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Instructional Technology Goal Goal Instructional Technology Goal Goal #1:	Increase teacher knowledge of instructional technology, including the use of the Activeboard, Crosspointe, and Learn system
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
35% of Staff using Learn	55% of staff using Learn
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	Minimal amount of professional days allocated for staff development.	Offer more after school training related to IT during pre-school work days as well as in addition to PLC time	PD coordinator	Development of professional development in house calendar for NPHS staff	Teacher attendance rate at PD sessions.

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Instructional Technology Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Readig Lab	Weekly free tutoring for students to help with Reading	Internal	$1,500.00
Mathematics	Mathematics tutoring for students	Math Lab staffed with certified Math instructors helping students after school	Internal	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $3,500.00

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
Reading	Instructional Focus Calender	Professional Development for teachers	District funding	$0.00
Mathematics	Professional Development for Instructional Focus Calendar	IFC training for staff to utilize	District	$0.00
Writing	Literacy Strategies for Writing Across the Curriculum	Professional Development for Content Area Staff to implement writing	Internal PD	$0.00
STEM	Instructional training for CTE teachers	CTE Trainings	District	$0.00
CTE	Industry Certification professional development for teachers needing to get certification	CTE Budget	Perkins Grants	$500.00
				Subtotal: $500.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance	Monitoring of student attendance for habitual unexcused absences	School Wide Support Team	School Support Service	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $4,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority   jn Focus   jn Prevent   jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes   jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Funding requests will be to support student programs at NPHS	$5,000.00

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

Monthly meetings of the SAC will review School initiatives, funding requests, and updates.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District NORTH PORT HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	46%	79%	81%	39%	245	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%	81%			131	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?	44% (NO)	74% (YES)			118	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					504	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District NORTH PORT HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	49%	77%	88%	31%	245	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	52%	71%			123	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?	44% (NO)	48% (NO)			92	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					470	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested