

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: DAVE THOMAS EDUCATION CENTER

District Name: Broward

Principal: Tracy Lockhart-Talley

SAC Chair: Sabrina Carter

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 08/21/12

Last Modified on: 10/8/2012

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)
					<p>School grade:</p> <p>2011-2012: Based on the 2012 reading FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 7th data not available, 8th increased by 2 percent, 9th increased by 2 percent, 10th decreased by 2 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 math FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 14%.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 writing FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th – decreased by 5 percent, 10th – decreased by 1 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 science FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 4 percent. The 2012 mean score for grade 11 on the End of Course (EOC) exam was 35 of 80.</p>

Principal

Tracy
Lockhart-
Talley

B.S. Marketing
M.S. Educational
Leadership
Certified in
Marketing (6-12)
and Educational
Leadership (K-
12)
ESOL
Endorsement

6

9

School Grade: Declining according to FCAT data.

2010-2011: According to READING FCAT report: Seventh graders increased from 24% to 30%; 8th graders increased from 16% to 19%; ninth graders increased from 5% to 6%, and 10th graders increased from 0% to 8%.

According to MATH FCAT report: 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math current year. Students achieving proficiency was 17% Black, and 22% Economically disadvantaged. Grade levels were unavailable.

According to WRITING FCAT report: Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 58% (64), and grade 10 students who perform a proficiency of 4.0 was 46% (51). Also, according to the 2011 AYP data achieving proficiency: White 92% (11); Blacks 86% (89); Hispanic 89% (25).

According to SCIENCE FCAT report: Students meeting proficiency, level 3 and above: 7% grade 8th and 1% for grade 11.

2009-2010:
School grade-No Grade Data (according to Department of Education report)

According to our 2010 MATH FCAT report: 12 % of 7th; 27% of 8th; 18% of 9th and 18% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above.

According to our 2010 READING FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 18% of 8th; 5% of 9th and 0% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above.

According to our 2010 WRITING FCAT report: 93% of 8th and 77% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. Scores for 8th is 7% and fir 11th 2% who scored at a level 3.

According to our 2010 SCIENCE FCAT report: 7% of 8th and 2% of 11 scored at a level 3. No student scored above a level 3.

*Additionally, 2009 AYP data for Math, grades 9 and 10 increased. From 2008 to 2009, Grades 9 increased from 14% to 21%, and Grade 10 increased from 26% to 27%.

*According to the 2009 AYP data for Science, the percentage of 10th grade students scoring Level 3 or above increased from 2% to 6% from the previous year.

*According to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Data for Reading, grade 10, the six percent score remained the same for both 2008 and 2009.

2008-2009:
School Grade: Declining

According to our 2009 MATH FCAT report: 13% of 7th graders, 22% 8th graders, 21 % of 9th graders, and 27% of 10th graders scored level 3 and above. According to our 2009 READING FCAT report indicates that 5% of 8th graders and 6% of 10th graders scored level 3 or above.

According to our WRITING 2009 data shows 78% of 8th graders and 44% 10th graders met high standards, 3.5 or above. According to our 2009 SCIENCE FCAT reports show that 1% of 8th graders scored at a level 3 or above and 6% of 11th graders scored at or above level 3.

2007-2008: School Improvement Rating was Improving

According to our 2008 MATH FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 30 % of 8th; 14 % of 9th and

					<p>26 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above. According to our 2008 READING FCAT report; 0 % of 7th; 19% of 8th; 12 % of 9th and 6 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above. According to our 2008 FCAT WRITING FCAT report 53% of 8th and 52% of 10th grade students scored at a 3.5 and above. According to our 2008 SCIENCE report: 5% of 8th grade students and 2% of 11th grade students scored at a level 3.</p> <p>2009-2010: Increased number of LCP's earned in ESOL program over previous year. Increased number of students passing GED exam (obtaining H.S. diploma) over previous year.</p> <p>2008-2009: Exceeded district goal by 10% for LCP's for ABE/GED and 2% for ESOL</p> <p>2007-2008: Increased number of LCP's in ABE/GED/ESOL by 25% over previous year</p> <p>2006-2007: Increased number of LCP's earned in ABE/GED/ESOL by 72% over previous year</p>
Assis Principal	Celeste Humphrey	Educational Leadership, All Levels ESE (K-12) Social Science (9-12) B.S. M.S.	6	6	<p>School grade:</p> <p>2011-2012: Based on the 2012 reading FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 7th data not available, 8th increased by 2 percent, 9th increased by 2 percent, 10th decreased by 2 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 math FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 14%.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 writing FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th – decreased by 5 percent, 10th – decreased by 1 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 science FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 4 percent. The 2012 mean score for grade 11 on the End of Course (EOC) exam was 35 of 80.</p> <p>School Grade: Declining according to FCAT data.</p> <p>2010-2011: According to READING FCAT report: Seventh graders increased from 24% to 30%; 8th graders increased from 16% to 19%; ninth graders increased from 5% to 6%, and 10th graders increased from 0% to 8%.</p> <p>According to FCAT MATH report: 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math current year Students achieving proficiency was 17% Black, and 22% Economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>According to WRITING FCAT report: Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 58% (64), and grade 10 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 46% (51). Also, according to the 2011 AYP data achieving proficiency: White 92% (11); Blacks 86% (89); Hispanic 89% (25).</p> <p>According to SCIENCE FCAT report:</p>

				<p>Students meeting proficiency, level 3 and above: 7% grade 8th and 1% for grade 11.</p> <p>2009-2010: School grade-No Grade Data (according to Department of Education report)</p> <p>According to our 2009 MATH FCAT report: 13% of 7th graders, 22% 8th graders, 21 % of 9th graders, and 27% of 10th graders scored level 3 and above. Our 2009 READING FCAT report indicates that 5% of 8th graders and 6% of 10th graders scored level 3 or above. Our WRITING 2009 data shows 78% of 8th graders and 44% 10th graders met high standards. Our 2009 SCIENCE FCAT reports show that 4% of 8th graders scored at a level 3 or above and 7% of 11th graders scored at or above level 3.</p> <p>Additionally, 2009 AYP data for Math, grades 9 and 10 increased. From 2008 to 2009, Grades 9 increased from 14% to 21%, and Grade 10 increased from 26% to 27%.</p> <p>*According to the 2009 AYP data for science, the percentage of 10th grade students scoring Level 3 or above increased from 2% to 6% from the previous year.</p> <p>2008-2009: School Grade: Declining</p> <p>According to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Data for Reading, grade 10, the six percent score remained the same for both 2008 and 2009.</p>	
Assis Principal	Glenda Daniels	Educational Leadership (K-12) B.S. M.S. ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed	3	<p>School grade:</p> <p>2011-2012: Based on the 2012 reading FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 7th data not available, 8th increased by 2 percent, 9th increased by 2 percent, 10th decreased by 2 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 math FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 14%.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 writing FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th – decreased by 5 percent, 10th – decreased by 1 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 science FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 4 percent. The 2012 mean score for grade 11 on the End of Course (EOC) exam was 35 of 80.</p> <p>School Grade: Declining according to FCAT data.</p> <p>2010-2011: According to READING FCAT report: Seventh graders increased from 24% to 30%; 8th graders increased from 16% to 19%; ninth graders increased from 5% to 6% and 10th graders increased from 0% to 8%.</p> <p>According to FCAT MATH report: 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math current year Students achieving proficiency was 17% Black, and 22% Economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>According to WRITING FCAT report: Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 58% (64), and grade 10 students who perform a proficiency of 4.0 was 46% (51). Also, according to the 2011 AYP data achieving proficiency: White 92% (11);</p>	

					<p>Blacks 86% (89); Hispanic 89% (25).</p> <p>According to SCIENCE FCAT report: Students meeting proficiency, level 3 and above: 7% grade 8th and 1% for grade 11.</p> <p>2009-2010: No Grade Data (according to Department of Education) According to our 2009 MATH FCAT report: 13% of 7th graders, 22% 8th graders, 21 % of 9th graders, and 27% of 10th graders scored level 3 and above. Our 2009 READING FCAT report indicates that 5% of 8th graders and 6% of 10th graders scored level 3 or above. Our WRITING 2009 data shows 78% of 8th graders and 44% 10th graders met high standards. Our 2009 SCIENCE FCAT reports show that 4% of 8th graders scored at a level 3 or above and 7% of 11th graders scored at or above level 3.</p> <p>Additionally, 2009 AYP data for Math, grades 9 and 10 increased. From 2008 to 2009, Grades 9 increased from 14% to 21%, and Grade 10 increased from 26% to 27%.</p> <p>Seagull Alternative High School According to 2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Data for Reading, the percentage 10th graders that received a level 3 or above was 7%. In Math the percentage of 10th grade students that received a level 3 or above was 26%. In Writing the percentage of 10th grade students that received a level 3 or above was 70%.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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)
					<p>School grade:</p> <p>2011-2012: Based on the 2012 reading FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 7th data not available, 8th increased by 2 percent, 9th increased by 2 percent, 10th decreased by 2 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 math FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 14%.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 writing FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th – decreased by 5 percent, 10th – decreased by 1 percent.</p> <p>Based on the 2012 science FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 4 percent. The 2012 mean score for grade 11 on the End of Course (EOC) exam was 35 of 80.</p> <p>School Grade: Declining</p> <p>2010-2011: According to READING FCAT report: Seventh graders increased from 24% to 30%; 8th graders increased from 16% to 19%; ninth graders increased from 5% to 6%, and 10th graders increased from 0% to 8%.</p>

Math

Jodi Schenkel

B.S. Mathematics Education
M.S. Mathematics Education
Certified in Mathematics 6-12

20

7

According to MATH FCAT report: 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math current year. Students achieving proficiency was 17% Black, and 22% Economically disadvantaged.

According to WRITING FCAT report: Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 58% (64), and grade 10 students who perform a proficiency of 4.0 was 46% (51).

According to SCIENCE FCAT report: Students meeting proficiency, level 3 and above: 7% grade 8th and 1% for grade 11.

2009-2010:
School grade-No Grade Data (according to Department of Education report)

According to our 2010 MATH FCAT report: 12 % of 7th; 27% of 8th; 18% of 9th and 18% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above.

According to our 2010 READING FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 18% of 8th; 5% of 9th and 0% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above.

According to our 2010 WRITING FCAT report: 93% of 8th and 77% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. Scores for 8th is 7% and fir 11th 2% who scored at a level 3.

According to our 2010 SCIENCE FCAT report: 7% of 8th and 2% of 11 scored at a level 3. No student scored above a level 3.

*Additionally, 2009 AYP data for Math, grades 9 and 10 increased. From 2008 to 2009, Grades 9 increased from 14% to 21%, and Grade 10 increased from 26% to 27%.

*According to the 2009 AYP data for Science, the percentage of 10th grade students scoring Level 3 or above increased from 2% to 6% from the previous year.

*According to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Data for Reading, grade 10, the six percent score remained the same for both 2008 and 2009.

2008-2009:
School Grade: Declining

According to our 2009 MATH FCAT report: 13% of 7th graders, 22% 8th graders, 21 % of 9th graders, and 27% of 10th graders scored level 3 and above. According to our 2009 READING FCAT report indicates that 5% of 8th graders and 6% of 10th graders scored level 3 or above.

According to our WRITING 2009 data shows 78% of 8th graders and 44% 10th graders met high standards, 3.5 or above.

According to our 2009 SCIENCE FCAT reports show that 1% of 8th graders scored at a level 3 or above and 6% of 11th graders scored at or above level 3

Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades, FCAT, and AYP information along with the associated school year)
The Dave Thomas Education Center – West Campus services a diverse population of students who are transient, academically deficient, have a GPA below a 2.0 and are failing at their home school. Due to these circumstances, we must collaborate with our social worker, family counselor, and ESE specialist to help motivate the students to become active learners. As a coach, I support teachers in the implementation of research-based instructional strategies. I work directly with teachers to provide classroom demonstrations in rigorous standards-based teaching. My data lead

review sessions reflect on both formative and summative assessments. These results determine the intervention strategies and materials I am going to choose for the struggling student. I also focus on enhancing teacher's abilities by providing professional development in an effort to meet the needs of all students. Classroom walkthroughs have provided evidence of my success. Teachers are incorporating new learning strategies in their content area that they have learned from my professional development trainings. When one interprets our FCAT scores, they must keep in mind our uniqueness as a school. Unfortunately, math scores do not reflect growth among the same group of students over time and, therefore, can be misleading. This year, the percent of students scoring 3 or above improved from 26% to 27%. Learning rose from 49% in 2007 to 58% in 2008.

2007-2008: School Improvement Rating was Improving
According to our 2008 MATH FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 30 % of 8th; 14 % of 9th and 26 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above.
According to our 2008 READING FCAT report: 0 % of 7th; 19% of 8th; 12 % of 9th and 6 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above.
According to our 2008 FCAT WRITING FCAT report 53% of 8th and 52% of 10th grade students scored at a 3.5 and above.
According to our 2008 SCIENCE report: 5% of 8th grade students and 2% of 11th grade students scored at a level 3.

School grade:

2011-2012:
Based on the 2012 reading FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 7th data not available, 8th increased by 2 percent, 9th increased by 2 percent, 10th decreased by 2 percent.

Based on the 2012 math FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 14%.

Based on the 2012 writing FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th – decreased by 5 percent, 10th – decreased by 1 percent.

Based on the 2012 science FCAT results, proficiency (level 3) levels are as follows: 8th grade decreased by 4 percent. The 2012 mean score for grade 11 on the End of Course (EOC) exam was 35 of 80.

School Grade: Declining

2010-2011: According to READING FCAT report: Seventh graders increased from 24% to 30%; 8th graders increased from 16% to 19%; ninth graders increased from 5% to 6%, and 10th graders increased from 0% to 8%.

According to MATH FCAT report: 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math current year. Students achieving proficiency was 17% Black, and 22% Economically disadvantaged.

According to WRITING FCAT report: Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 58% (64), and grade 10 students who perform a proficiency of 4.0 was 46% (51).

According to SCIENCE FCAT report: Students meeting proficiency, level 3 and above: 7% grade 8th and 1% for grade 11

2009-2010:
School grade-No Grade Data (according to

Reading	Sabrina Carter	B.S.- Communication M.S.- Reading K-12	6	2	<p>Department of Education report)</p> <p>According to our 2010 MATH FCAT report: 12 % of 7th; 27% of 8th; 18% of 9th and 18% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above. According to our 2010 READING FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 18% of 8th; 5% of 9th and 0% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. According to our 2010 WRITING FCAT report: 93% of 8th and 77% of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. Scores for 8th is 7% and fir 11th 2% who scored at a level 3. According to our 2010 SCIENCE FCAT report: 7% of 8th and 2% of 11 scored at a level 3. No student scored above a level 3.</p> <p>*Additionally, 2009 AYP data for Math, grades 9 and 10 increased. From 2008 to 2009, Grades 9 increased from14% to 21%, and Grade 10 increased from 26% to 27%.</p> <p>*According to the 2009 AYP data for Science, the percentage of 10th grade students scoring Level 3 or above increased from 2% to 6% from the previous year.</p> <p>*According to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Data for Reading, grade 10, the six percent score remained the same for both 2008 and 2009.</p> <p>This year I developed and implemented ACT classes as an alternative for FCAT. The results were 52% of students who took the test passed. The Dave Thomas Education Center – West Campus services a diverse population of students who are transient, academically deficient, have a GPA below a 2.0 and are failing at their home school. Due to these circumstances, we must collaborate with our social worker, family counselor, and ESE specialist to help motivate the students to become active learners. As a coach, I support teachers in the implementation of research-based instructional strategies. I work directly with teachers to provide classroom demonstrations in rigorous standards-based teaching. My data lead review sessions reflect on both formative and summative assessments. These results determine the intervention strategies and materials I am going to choose for the struggling student. I also focus on enhancing teacher's abilities by providing professional development in an effort to meet the needs of all students. Classroom walkthroughs have provided evidence of my success. Teachers are incorporating new learning strategies in their content area that they have learned from my professional development trainings. When one interprets our FCAT scores, they must keep in mind our uniqueness as a school. Unfortunately, reading scores do not reflect growth among the same group of students over time and, therefore, can be misleading. This year, the percent of students scoring 3 or above remained consistent wit last year (6%). Learning rose from 17% in 2007 to 35% in 2008.</p> <p>2008-2009: School Grade: Declining</p> <p>According to our 2009 MATH FCAT report: 13% of 7th graders, 22% 8th graders, 21 % of 9th graders, and 27% of 10th graders scored level 3 and above. According to our 2009 READING FCAT report indicates that 5% of 8th graders and 6% of 10th graders scored level 3 or above. According to our WRITING 2009 data shows 78% of 8th graders and 44% 10th graders met high standards, 3.5 or above. According to our 2009 SCIENCE FCAT reports show that 1% of 8th graders scored at a level 3 or above and 6% of 11th graders scored at or above level 3.</p>
---------	----------------	---	---	---	---

					2007-2008: School Improvement Rating was Improving According to our 2008 MATH FCAT report: 24% of 7th; 30 % of 8th; 14 % of 9th and 26 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above. According to our 2008 READING FCAT report; 0 % of 7th; 19% of 8th; 12 % of 9th and 6 % of 10th grade students scored at a level 3 and above. According to our 2008 FCAT WRITING FCAT report 53% of 8th and 52% of 10th grade students scored at a 3.5 and above. According to our 2008 SCIENCE report: 5% of 8th grade students and 2% of 11th grade students scored at a level 3.
--	--	--	--	--	---

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	Encourage continuing education	Celeste Humphrey	Ongoing 2012-2013	
2	Encourage Board Certification	Celeste Humphrey	Ongoing 2012-2013	
3	Job Fair Recruitment	Celeste Humphrey	Ongoing 2012-2013	
4	New Educators Support System	Linda Johnson	Ongoing 2012-2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	2.2%(1)	19.6%(9)	34.8%(16)	43.5%(20)	58.7%(27)	45.7%(21)	13.0%(6)	4.3%(2)	26.1%(12)

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
		NESS-	

Linda Johnson	none at this time	Experienced mentors are paired with new teachers or transferring teachers to provide assistance in making a smooth transition to an alternative high school environment. N/A	Monthly as needed
Jodi Schenkel and Sabrina Carter	none at this time	Orientation/Support -Experienced mentors are paired with new teachers or transferring teachers to provide assistance in making a smooth transition to an alternative high school environment.	Observing/Coaching/PLCs Monthly as needed
Sabrina Carter	none at this time	Orientation/Support -Experienced mentors are paired with new teachers or transferring teachers to provide assistance in making a smooth transition to an alternative high school environment.	Observing/Coaching/PLCs Monthly as needed

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

RtI - Administrative staff (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Daniels, Mrs. Humphrey); guidance (Mrs. Drayton, Mrs. Mrs.V. Humphrey); family counselor (Mr. Wells); social worker (Ms. Hall); school psychologist (Ms. Karen Cottrell, Jami Moll); teachers, curriculum coaches, (Mrs. Dean, Ms. Schenkel); department chairs, (Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Allen); and School Advisory Council chair (Mrs. Carter); ESE Specialist and facilitator (Mrs. Provenzano, Mrs. Warren). Additionally, the teacher(s) of referred student(s) along with the school psychologist.

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?

Administrators will coordinate and facilitate meetings – as needed - for Drew (Mrs. Daniels) and West (Mrs. Humphrey) campuses. RtI designees, Barbara Mills (Drew Resource) and John Wells (West) will act as case manager and/or maintain tracking and recording systems. RtI data is stored in a locked, confidential and secure area.

(e.g., meeting processes and roles /functions). Referral made to RtI Team. The student's problem is defined, behavioral and/or instructional. Implementation of the plan by team and teachers. Monitor/measure to see if adjustments need to be made. The RtI team is responsible for the development and implementation of the SIP. Additionally, RtI team will review and monitor students who are not responding to the core program and make recommendations for more intense and/or frequent support as needed.

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 team has provided teachers with Tier 1, academic/behavioral strategies to be implemented in the classrooms. The team will monitor/evaluate all RtI referrals. By utilizing the RtI process, DTEC's attendance will increase and suspensions will decrease, i.e. 2010-2011 SIP goals. The core team members will look at the school-wide approach to behavior and determine if modifications are needed to meet the needs of our students. Additionally, teachers will abide by the tiers as they recognize

behaviors as they seek to identify students at risk.

MTSS Implementation

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

Tier 1 interventions include: Data sources, i.e. Progress Monitoring through observation, parent conference, Terms data, grades, progress reports, attendance reports, disciplinary records, teacher anecdotal, progress monitoring graphs and records.

Tier 2 interventions include: Data sources from Tier 1 along with individual academic and behavioral strategies/interventions, formal observations, data will be graphed, and progress monitoring report.

Tier 3 interventions include: Data sources from Tiers 1 and 2 along with more individual/intense academic and behavioral strategies/interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school psychologist (Karen Cottrell) will facilitate/present a training for the staff and address any questions about the RTI process. Other elements of RtI that staff will receive include additional training on the behaviors targeted for intervention and expectations that are taught when dealing with students. Teachers will be providing with strategies to address students' targeted behaviors, the implementation of interventions, making referrals, implementation and continuous training of CHAMPS skills and strategies.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administrators and MTSS/RtI team will continue to lend support to teachers when referrals are submitted, along with student interventions to ensure the success and safety of students and all involved.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Math curriculum coach (& high school teacher), Ms. Schenkel, middle school curriculum coach (& high school teacher), Mrs. Dean, and Reading coach, Mrs. Carter; administrators, (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels); guidance, (Mrs. V. Humphrey and Mrs. Drayton); media specialist, (Mrs. Kalish); ESOL (Mrs. Gilles), and ESE (Mrs. Provenzano); middle school teacher, Mrs. Colston-Leslie.

The LLT members were selected because they are knowledgeable about curriculum and district policies and procedures

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

The major goal of the LLT team is to increase student literacy through Supplemental Intervention Reading Programs, daily vocabulary development, differentiated instruction, curriculum assessment and instructional/student skills, district led adoptions. Student data will be analyzed via Virtual Counselor, BAT and mini benchmark assessments, BAT I and II writing assessments and FCAT scores. Once the data is collected and analyzed, teachers will implement differentiated instruction in the classroom to meet the needs of the students.

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

DTEC's major initiatives for the current school year are novel reads, book displays, motivational bulletin boards, utilization of our Community Partners, and project based research activities. Through these initiatives, students will become more engaged in the reading process which will be monitored through reading logs.

Teachers literacy and knowledge will be addressed through monthly PLC meetings which will appear on the agenda during the month of sharing, through department/subject collaboration, staff needs assessments/surveys. Staff development

workshops are scheduled.

All teachers will implement vocabulary DI instruction to increase comprehension through CRISS strategies. The reading coach (Mrs. Carter) mentors all perspective reading endorsement/CAR-PD teachers. Members of the team conduct classroom walkthroughs, data chats, and administrative lesson plan reviews. The reading coach encourages highly qualified instructors with current CAR-PD/reading endorsement workshops.

To implement strategies that spans across the curriculum for each teacher/subject area are:

Reading – Seventh through tenth grade categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 which include vocabulary, main idea, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text. In addition, assigned novel reading will be implemented quarterly.

Writing - Emphasis will be targeted on assessment for the 8th and 10th grade writing students.

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.

Desegregation of data is established in order to determine school-wide strengths and weaknesses. Based on the data, a school-wide focus calendar that aligns with CCSS will be created integrating benchmark focused activities that reflect reinforcement or enrichment. Through the bi-weekly PLCs and teaming, the staff receives reading across the curriculum strategies to implement during class time. Content area teachers are provided with high yield strategies along with the implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC), CCSS training, reviews, and implementation. A school-wide literacy plan is also implemented during PLCs. The reading coach works closely with teachers who express an interest in becoming reading endorsed by providing information about classes, study guides, testing dates, etc. The strategies are being monitored through classroom walkthroughs.

*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?

Students and staff members visit Broward College to a countywide College Expo. Students receive ASVAB testing, and are exposed to guest speakers from vocational schools. Students are also exposed to post-secondary recruiters from colleges, universities, and technical centers who will deliver pertinent information as it relates to higher learning. Additionally, a career component provided through the E-Pep preparation piece for middle school students.

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?

Student course selection and academic/career planning is met initially through the individual Guidance Registration meeting with the parent and/or student prior to entry into DTEC. After the student has enrolled, school counselors are available daily to meet with students to address and assist in developing their Individual Education/Career Plan.

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](#)

Off campus visits to neighboring Broward College during college career day, on campus visits from community businesses, partners, via DTEC's Career Day. Our guidance director, L. Drayton, invites post secondary recruiters/guests to speak with students about college readiness, admissions, etc. Students are also invited to take the ASVAB in preparation for possible entry into the armed forces. Additionally, our guidance director collaborates with Atlantic Technical Center's Share Time Program counselor to ensure a seamless entry process for our interested students. This collaboration provides an on-campus orientation, facility tour, testing facilitation, and face to face entry notification.

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:	Areas in need of improvement are: vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text and research process.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students scoring at level 3 are as follows: Grade 10 - 5%(3); grade 9 - 8% (5); grade 8 - 19% (14). No data for grade 7.	By June 2013, the expected level of performance will increase by 3%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic Attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teachers Behavioral specialist Attendance clerk	Teachers Attendance reports through Pinnacle	Attendance reports Pinnacle
2	Lack of academic ability	Daily Vocabulary Development Interactive word walls Graphic organizers Direct Instruction	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coach	Classroom walk throughs Data chats Lesson plans	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios
3	Not enough focused instruction	Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coaches	Data collection Monthly student reviews Mini Assessments	Mini assessments BAT Teacher generated tests Portfolios

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:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Areas in need of improvement are: vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, and informational text and research process.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on FCAT data: According to 2012 data: 10th grade - 2%(1)of students scored at or above level 4. 9th grade - 3% (2) students scored at or above level 4. 8th grade - 4% (3) students scored at or above level 4. 7th grade - no data available.	By June 2013, students scoring at or above level 4 will increase by 2%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of opportunity for enrichment activities	Push-in & Pull-out with focused instruction on cat. 1 & 4. Data chats w/students to discuss progress Vocabulary Development to enhance cat. 1 Use of graphic organizers	Curriculum coach Classroom teachers	Data chat reviews and immediate feedback with high level 3 students Assessments	Mini assessment BAT I & II Teacher generated tests Rubric for graphic organizers
2	Opportunities for remediation at home	Provide at-home resource information	Teachers Parents Front desk receptionist Curriculum coach Reading teachers	Newsletters Parent Link Registration information	BAT I & II Mini Assessments
3	Provide at-home resource information	Provide at-home resource information	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coaches	Monthly student reviews Data collection	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios FAIR

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	n/a
--	-----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Black, Hispanic, Economically disadvantaged students are in need of improvement in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: 57.1% (4) of students made learning gains.	By June 2013 students making learning gains will increase to 67%.

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 academic support/reinforcement at home	Provide at-home resource information during Open House, Family meetings, SAC/SAF meetings, and during parent and IEP conferences.	Parents Front desk receptionist Curriculum coach	Newsletters Parent Link Registration information	Parent Surveys Mini Assessments
2	Not enough targeted instruction	Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities through targeted pull-out instruction.	Administrators Curriculum coaches	Monthly student reviews and data collection which will be analyzed for instruction.	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios FAIR 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 group:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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 #					
	To continue to reduce the reading achievement gap by 3% 2012-2013 year, 5% 2013-2014 year, 7% 2014-2015, 9% 2015-2016, increasing by 2% each year.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	12.4%	15.4%	20.4%	27.4%	36.4%	

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:	These students include Blacks, Hispanic, White, Indian, Asian.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 data as follows: White students not making progress - 77.8% (14) Black students not making progress - 86.7% (104) Hispanic students not making progress - 83.8% (31) Indian students not making progress - 100% (1) Asian students - n/a	By June 2013, the number of students not making learning gains will be decreased by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic attendance	Parental contact	Teachers Observations and referrals to RtI team Attendance clerk Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team ESE specialist/facilitator School Family Counselor and Social Worker	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher generated testing Mini assessment BAT I and II
2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Pull-out and push in small groups Use of graphic organizers Vocabulary development	Teachers Reading coach Administrators ESE specialist and support facilitator ESOL contact	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher observation IPT testing Mini assessments BAT I and II IEP FAIR
3	Not enough focused instruction	Professional development to cover vocabulary enhancement, reading application (cat. 2) Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE specialist/support facilitators	Monthly data collection and review Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Student work samples	FCAT data BAT I & II Writing results Teacher observation

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:	2013 FCAT data: vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, informational text and research process.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: 87.5% (7) did not make satisfactory progress.	By June 2013, the number of ELL not making progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team ESE specialist/facilitator	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher generated testing Mini assessment BAT I & II
2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Pull-out and push in small groups Use of graphic organizers Vocabulary development	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE support facilitators ESOL contact	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher observation IPT testing Mini assessments BAT IEP
3	Language deficiency	ESOL instructional strategies Direct and differentiated instruction Pull-out, push in instruction	Teachers ESOL contact Curriculum coach	Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation	BAT I & II IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher generated tests IPT Testing

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:	Vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis, informational text and research process
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: 95.2% (20) of students did not make satisfactory progress.	By June 2013 the percentage of students not making progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate implementation of IEPs not being followed by teachers.	Strict IEP follow-up/monitoring	Administrative team ESE facilitators and specialist	IEP feedback reports Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation	IEP reports

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:	vocabulary, literary analysis, reading application, and informational text and research process.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: 84.7% (133) of students did not make satisfactory progress.	By June 2013, the percentage of students not making progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge of in-house and outside resources	Free and Reduced lunch applications Notification to community agencies and all stakeholders who may be able to provide funding, in-kind donations/services. Scholarship information/applications PLCs during preplanning week Resources via school social workers Parent meetings	DTEC's family counselor Curriculum coach Administrative team ESOL and ESE specialist/facilitator	Returned applications/forms/referrals	Collection of completed applications Followup on referrals Letters of acceptance (scholarships/grants)
2	Sporadic Attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Attendance clerk	Teacher observation DTEC's family counselor	Attendance reports via Pinnacle

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
				All faculty, grades, departments, support staff personnel; Department meeting will be conducted monthly and on Early Release Days: 9/27/12	Teacher monitoring	

Topics will include technology, discussion monthly, PLC participation.	all grades/subjects	Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels) Reading coach (Mrs. Carter)	all staff/faculty	10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13 PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13	Data chats Review data of mini assessments Lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs	Reading coach (Mrs. Carter) Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels)
--	---------------------	--	-------------------	---	---	--

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Daily review of vocabulary terms, continued implementation of Next Generation SSS focus and District distributed IFCs.	textbooks		\$1,491.00
			Subtotal: \$1,491.00
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
Monday monthly staff development days and early release dates: PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 ER - 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13	conferences	inservice	\$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: \$1,491.00

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:	These students include those who speak English and understand spoken English @ grade level in comparison to non-ELL students.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

The number of students scoring proficiency in listening and speaking is 28% (11).

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	Language deficiency Teachers ESOL contact	ESOL instructional strategies Direct and differentiated instruction Pull-out, push in instruction	Teachers ESOL contact Curriculum coach	Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation	BAT I & II IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher generated tests IPT Testing

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:

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

The number of students proficient in reading is 13% (5).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic attendance	Letters home Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team. Parent contact	Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team	ESE specialist/facilitator Classroom Walkthroughs	Teacher observation Data chats Teacher generated testing Mini assessment BAT I & II
2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Pull-out and push in small groups Use of graphic organizers Vocabulary development	ESE support facilitators ESOL contact Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Teacher observation	IPT testing Mini assessments BAT I & II IEP
3	Language deficiency	Direct and differentiated instruction Pull-out, push in instruction	Teachers ESOL contact Curriculum coach	ESOL instructional strategies Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation	BAT I & II IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher

					generated tests
					IPT Testing

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Students scoring proficient in writing are 10% (4).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of targeted instruction in persuasive writing	Ongoing practice prompts Peer to peer editing Teach Six Traits Writing Rubric to students	Administrative team Curriculum coach	Peer to peer tutoring/editing/feedback Six Traits Writing Rubric Revisits and revisions of previous prompts Portfolios	Teacher observation Students' writing prompt responses BAT I and II

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
IPT testing			\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
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
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: \$3,000.00

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Areas in need of improvement in math include number operations, problems and statistics; expressions, equations and functions; geometry and measurement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students achieving proficiency are as follows: grade 8th - 10% (7) grade 7th - no data available	By June of 2013, each grade level will increase its score by 3%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic Attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teachers Behavioral specialist Attendance clerk	Teachers Attendance reports through Pinnacle	Attendance reports Pinnacle
2	Lack of academic ability	Daily Vocabulary Development Interactive word walls Graphic organizers Direct Instruction	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coach	Classroom walk throughs Data chats Lesson plans	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Student data taken from FCAT data. Students making gains in this category will be monitored with emphasis placed on maintaining/increasing scores.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 8th - 7% (5) of students scored at level 4. Grade 7th - no data available	By June of 2013 3% of students will score at level 4 and above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of opportunity for enrichment activities	Push-in, pull-out Data chats CRISS Test specs	Curriculum coach Classroom teachers	Data chat reviews and immediate feedback with high level 3 students Student work Assessments	Mini assessments BAT Teacher generated tests

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Black, Economically disadvantaged students are in need of improvement in Math.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: students making learning gains is 33.3% (1)	By June 2013 students will increase by 3% in learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Opportunities for remediation at home	Provide at-home resource information during Open House, Family Nights, SAC/SAF meetings, and during parent conferences.	Parents Front desk receptionist Curriculum coaches	Newsletters Parent Link Registration information	Mini assessment BAT I & II
2	Not enough targeted instruction	Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Administrators Curriculum coaches	Monthly student reviews	Data collection Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	n/a for our students. This assessment is for severe ESE students.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	n/a
---	-----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # To continue to reduce the math achievement gap by 3% 2012-2013 year, 5% 2013-2014 year, 7% 2014-2015, 9% 2015-2016, increasing by 2% each year.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	33%	36%	41%	48%	57%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	These students include Blacks, Hispanic, White, Indian, Asian.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 data: Whites not making satisfactory progress is 75% (15) Blacks not making satisfactory progress is 91% (165) Hispanic not making satisfactory progress is 83% (40) Asian not making satisfactory progress is 100% (2) Indian not making satisfactory progress is 100% (1)	By June 2013, the number of students not making learning gains will be decreased by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic attendance	Parental contact	Teachers Observations and referrals to RtI team Attendance clerk Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team ESE specialist/facilitator School Family Counselor and Social Worker	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher generated testing Mini assessment BAT I and II

2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Repetition Differentiated Instruction Use of Graphic Organizers	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE specialist/support facilitators	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Lesson plans	Teacher observation IEP Mini assessments IPT assessment BAT I & II Rubric for graphic organizers
3	Not enough focused instruction	Professional development to cover vocabulary enhancement Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE specialist/support facilitators	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Student work samples Monthly data collection and review	FCAT data BAT I & II Teacher observation

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	According to data for the percentage of ELL, areas in need of improvement in math include number sense, expressions, measurement; geometry and spatial sense; algebraic thinking, and data analysis and probability.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: ELL students not making satisfactory progress is 94% (16).	By June 2013, the percentage of students not making progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team ESE specialist/facilitator	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher generated testing Mini assessment BAT I & II
2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Pull-out and push in small groups Use of graphic organizers Vocabulary development	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE support facilitators ESOL contact	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher observation IPT testing Mini assessments BAT IEP
	Language deficiency	ESOL instructional strategies	Teachers	Classroom walkthroughs	BAT I & II

3		Direct and differentiated instruction Pull-out, push in instruction	ESOL contact Curriculum coach	Teacher observation	IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher generated tests IPT Testing
4					

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Areas of concern include number, expressions, geometry/measurement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 data: Students not making satisfactory progress is 88% (21)	By June 2012, SWD students not making progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate implementation of IEPs not being followed by teachers.	Strict IEP follow-up/monitoring	Administrative team ESE facilitators and specialist	IEP feedback reports Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation	IEP reports

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	areas in need of improvement in math include number sense, concepts and operations; measurement; geometry and spatial sense; algebraic thinking, and data analysis and probability.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012: Students not making satisfactory progress is 90% (187).	By June 2013, the number of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of knowledge of in-house and outside	Free and Reduced lunch applications	DTEC's family counselor	Returned applications/forms/	Collection of completed

1	resources	Notification to community agencies and all stakeholders who may be able to provide funding, in-kind donations/services. Scholarship information/applications PLCs during preplanning week Resources via school social workers Parent meetings	Curriculum coach Administrative team ESOL and ESE specialist/facilitator	referrals	applications Followup on referrals Letters of acceptance (scholarships/grants)
2	Sporadic Attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Attendance clerk	Teacher observation DTEC's family counselor	Attendance reports via Pinnacle
3					

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

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:	n/a
---	-----

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

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

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:	Areas in need of improvement in math include number sense, concepts and operations; measurement; geometry and spatial sense; algebraic thinking, and data analysis and probability.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
According to FCAT 2012 data: The mean score for the EOC exam was 373 (13).	By June 2013, the mean score will increase by 5%.		
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	Sporadic Attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teachers Behavioral specialist Attendance clerk	Teachers Attendance reports through Pinnacle	Attendance reports Pinnacle
2	Lack of academic ability	Daily Vocabulary Development Interactive word walls Graphic organizers Direct Instruction	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coach	Classroom walk throughs Data chats Lesson plans	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios
3	Not enough focused instruction	Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coaches	Data collection Monthly student reviews Mini Assessments	Mini assessments BAT Teacher generated tests Portfolios

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT results 2012: 3.8% (5) scored at or above level 4.	By June 2013, students who score at/above level 4 will increase by 3%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of opportunity for enrichment activities	Push-in Data chats CRISS Test specs	Curriculum coach Classroom teachers	Data chat reviews Assessments Teacher feedback Student work	Mini assessment BAT Teacher generated tests

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 # To continue to reduce the math achievement gap by 3% 2012-2013 year, 5% 2013-2014 year, 7% 2014-2015, 9% 2015-2016, increasing by 2% each year.
3A :	

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	373	376	381	388	397	

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:	no data
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	no data
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
no data	no data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	no data
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	no data
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
no data	no data

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	Two-dimensional geometry, three-dimensional geometry, Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 data: 11.3% (7) of students scored at level 3	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring at level 3 will increase by 3%.

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teachers Behavioral specialist Attendance clerk	Teachers Attendance reports through Pinnacle	Attendance records Pinnacle
2	Lack of academic ability	Daily Vocabulary Development Interactive word walls Graphic organizers Direct Instruction	Teachers Administrators Curriculum coach	Classroom walkthroughs Data chats Lesson plans	Mini assessments BAT I & II Portfolios

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:	Two-dimensional geometry 2. Three-dimensional geometry 3. Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0) scored at or above levels 4-5	By June 2013, students scoring at this level will increase by 3%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Differentiated instruction Use of graphic organizers strategies	Teachers Curriculum coach ESE support facilitator	Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Lesson plans	BAT I & II Mini assessments Teacher generated tests

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 # To continue to reduce the math achievement gap by 3% 2012-2013 year, 5% 2013-2014 year, 7% 2014-2015, 9% 2015-2016, increasing by 2% each year.				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	11.3%	14.3%	19.3%	26.3%	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	This category includes: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Indian
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 data: White students - 50% (1) did not make satisfactory progress Black students - 96% (43) did not make satisfactory progress Hispanic students - 68% (8) did not make satisfactory progress Asian students - 100% (1) did not make satisfactory progress Indian students - n/a	By June 2013, 3% from each subgroup will make satisfactory progress.

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	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Guidance Curriculum coach Administrative team ESE specialist/facilitator	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Mini assessment BAT Teacher generated tests
2	Lack of academic ability	Direct Instruction Pull-out and push in small groups Repetition Differentiated Instruction Use of Graphic Organizers	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE specialist/support facilitators	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Lesson plans	Teacher observation IEP Mini assessments BAT Rubric for graphic organizers
3	Not enough focused instruction	Professional development to cover vocabulary enhancement Implementation of enrichment reinforced activities	Teachers Curriculum coach Administrators ESE specialist/support facilitators	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Student work samples Monthly data collection and review	FCAT data BAT I & II Teacher observation

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:	Areas of concern are Two-dimensional geometry, three-dimensional geometry, Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 Data: 89%(8) of students did not make satisfactory progress.	By June 2013, the number of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Attendance clerk Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team, guidance, etc. Curriculum coaches Administrative team DTEC's family counselor ESE specialist/facilitator	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats	Teacher generated testing Mini assessments BAT
2	Lack of academic ability Direct Instruction Pull-out, push-in ESOL strategies	Differentiated instruction Use of graphic organizers Direct Instruction ESOL strategies	Teachers ESOL contacts curriculum coach ESE support facilitators	Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation Data chats Lesson plans	BAT IEP IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher generated tests
3	Language deficiency	ESOL Instructional strategies Direct and differentiated instruction.	Teachers ESOL contacts Curriculum coach	Classroom walkthroughs Teacher observation Lesson plans Student work	5B.3. BAT IPT Testing Mini assessments Teacher generated tests ESOL Matrix

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:	Areas of concern two-dimensional geometry, three-dimensional geometry, Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 data: 0% (5) of students did not make satisfactory progress	By June 2013, SWD not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate implementation of IEPs not being followed by teachers.	Strict IEP follow-up/monitoring	Administrative team ESE facilitators and specialist	IEP feedback reports Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher observation	IEP

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:	Areas of concern Two-dimensional geometry, three-dimensional geometry, Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 data: 90% (44) students did not make satisfactory progress	By June 2013, students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge of in-house and outside resources	Free and Reduced lunch applications Notification of community agencies Scholarship information/applications	DTEC's family counselor Guidance counselors Curriculum coach Administrative team ESOL Contact ESE specialist/facilitators	Returned applications/forms/referrals	Collection of completed applications Followup on referrals Letters of acceptance (scholarships/grants)
2	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home	Teacher observations and referrals to RtI team Attendance clerk	Teacher observation DTEC's family counselor	Attendance reports via Pinnacle

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
Continued project based learning.	All grades/subjects.	Curriculum math coaches (Ms. Schenkel)and middle school curriculum coach Ms. Dean) Administrative team (Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels) ESE specialist and facilitato, Mrs. Provenzano and Mrs. Warren	Faculty/staff	Department meeting will be conducted monthly and on Early Release Days: 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13 PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13	Mini and teacher assessments Teacher monitoring Classroom walkthroughs Administrative data chats Ongoing department meetings	Curriculum coaches Administrative team ESOL and ESE specialist/facilitator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Researched based lessons	textbooks		\$4,840.00
			Subtotal: \$4,840.00
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
Monday monthly staff development days and early release dates: PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 ER - 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13	conferences		\$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: \$4,840.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of motivation	District approved IFC will be utilized. The revision of the IFCs will be data driven. CRISS strategies to be modeled during PLC/PD identified days:	Science curriculum coach Administrators.	Classroom walkthroughs Classroom observations On going assessments. Data chats Lesson plans	Assessment data. Teacher observations. FCAT
2	No opportunity for enhanced curriculum.	Differentiated instruction. Classroom science experiments/hands-on application. CRISS strategies to be modeled during PLC/PD identified days: Test specs	Science classroom teachers. Science curriculum coach	Classroom walkthroughs and observations. Student work samples. Data chats	Assessment data Teacher observations.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Areas showing non-proficiency include: Physical and Chemical, Earth and Space, Life and Environmental, and Science Thinking.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT data:0.9% (1) student scored at level 4 and above.	By June 2013, 1% of students - grades 8 - will score at a level 4 or above

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who see no advantage to passing the assessment.	In-school rewards and activities for attendance during testing dates.	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Assessment data reports Classroom walkthroughs and observations.	Attendance data via clerk
2	Teacher motivation/knowledge	PLCs for teachers. CRISS strategies Differentiated instruction examples.	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Student work displayed. Classroom walkthrough Lesson plans	Assessment data Teacher generated tests.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	Biology: genetics, evolution, ecology, classification/diversity, plants and animals, human biology.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT 2012 results are as follows: 10% (11) of students scored at level 3 in biology. Grade 11 - mean score was 35 of 80.	By June 2013, students scoring at level 3 will increase by 3%. The mean score for grade 11 will increase by 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who see no advantage to passing the assessment.	In-school rewards and activities for attendance during testing dates	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Assessment data reports Classroom walkthroughs and observations.	Attendance data via clerk
2	Teacher motivation/knowledge	PLCs for teachers. CRISS strategies Differentiated instruction examples.	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Student work displayed. Classroom walkthrough Lesson plans	Assessment data Teacher generated tests.

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:	Biology: genetics, evolution, ecology, classification/diversity, plants and animals, human biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students scoring at or above level 4 is .9% (1).	By June 2013, the number of students scoring at or above level 4 will increase by 2%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who see no advantage to passing the assessment.	In-school rewards and activities for attendance during testing dates.	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Assessment data reports Classroom walkthroughs and observations.	Attendance data via clerk
2	Teacher motivation/knowledge	PLCs for teachers. CRISS strategies Differentiated	Curriculum coach Science teachers	Student work displayed. Classroom walkthrough	Assessment data Teacher generated tests.

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
Topics will include Demonstration Lab Development of science terminology Hands-on learning Problem based learning Technology infusion	All faculty	Curriculum coaches District personnel Administration	Science PLC	All faculty, grades, departments, support staff personnel; Department meeting will be conducted monthly and on Early Release Days: 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13 PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13	Classroom walkthroughs Administrative data chats Ongoing department meetings	Curriculum coaches Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research based lessons	textbooks		\$901.00
			Subtotal: \$901.00
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: \$901.00

* 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:	Areas in need of improvement: Persuasive writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 3.0 - 3.5 was 32% (21). Grade 10 students who performed a proficiency of 3.0 - 3.5 was 46% (30). Grade 8 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 or higher was 8% (5). Grade 10 students who performed a proficiency of 4.0 was 0.	By June 2013 scores will increase by 10% for grades 8 and 10.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of targeted instruction in persuasive writing	Ongoing practice prompts Peer to peer editing Teach Six Traits Writing Rubric to students	Curriculum coach Administrative team	Peer to peer tutoring/editing/feedback Six Traits Writing Rubric Revisits and revisions of previous prompts	Portfolios Teacher observation Students' writing prompt responses BAT I and II
2	Sporadic attendance	Parent contact Letters home Use of Family Counselor	Teachers Administrative team Attendance clerk Data specialist	Teacher observation Accessing and analyzing attendance reports from Pinnacle	Sign-in sheets Reports from Optispool and Pinnacle

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Topics will include technology, discussion monthly, PLC participation	All grades/subjects	Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels) Reading coach (Mrs. Carter)	All faculty	All faculty, grades, departments, support staff personnel; Department meeting will be conducted monthly and on Early Release Days: 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13 PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13	Teacher monitoring Data chats Review data of mini assessments Lesson plans Practice prompts Classroom walkthroughs	Reading coach (Mrs. Carter) Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels)

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research based lessons			\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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
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: \$1,000.00

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal # 1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Civics.				
Civics Goal # 2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Civics 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 Civics Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
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:	DTEC has several programs on multiple campuses that contribute to our attendance rate, i.e. teen parent program. State statute allows teen parent programs more leniency.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
78.5%	Attendance rate shall increase to 90% by June 2013.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
n/a	The number of students with excessive absence will decrease to 15% by June 2013.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
87	The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease to 12% by June 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student motivation	School based rewards for attendance such as movie day, field trips, etc. on early release days: Additionally, parent contact and conferencing with students. Early release: 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13	-Attendance clerk Family Counselor/guidance	Attendance clerk report Teacher observation and reports	Attendance data

		PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 Referral to Family counselor/guidance			
2	Limited opportunity for extracurricular activities.	Field days Movie Days DTEC Idol Show Early Release: Ice Cream Social 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13 PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 Women of Tomorrow Mentoring Program through Girlscouts program DTEC Steppers Chorus	Curriculum coaches Teachers Administrators	Student participation in activities	Participation log

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
school based activities and incentives			\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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: \$600.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The need for these students should continue to decrease and incentives should be offered to encourage student success.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
79	By June 2013, the number of in-school suspensions will be decreased from 79 to 69.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
Number of Students with Internal Suspensions: 64.	By June 2013, the number of internal suspensions will decrease to 54.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
Number of External Suspensions: 220 students.	By June 2013, the number of external suspensions will decrease to 210.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
Number of Students with External Suspensions: 162	By June 2013, the number of external suspensions will decrease to 142.
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	Inconsistent use of school-wide discipline plan.	Retrain teachers on school-wide discipline plan. Teacher/administrator chats	Administrators.	Classroom walkthroughs and trend data.	Trend data, DMS reports. Data from Discipline Matrix
2	Inconsistent use of strategies for classroom management.	CHAMPS training (PLCs)	Administrators.	Classroom observation and trend data.	Trend data, DMS reports Data from Discipline Matrix CHAMPS Rubric and the Basic 5

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	school based activities and incentives		\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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: \$600.00

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	Data forthcoming
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
Data forthcoming	By June 2013 (data forthcoming)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
Data forthcoming	By June 2013, (data forthcoming)

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	Code process for updating/correcting withdrawn students.	Develop a process for correcting withdrawal codes. Train IMS	Data Processor	Followup of data base. Reports from Optispool.	Ongoing monitoring of school data.
2	Dropout rate varies per race/gender	Implementation of career day ASVAB testing Community businesses and partner guest speakers College visits to Broward College 'Women of Tomorrow' mentoring program	Curriculum coach BRACE advisor Guidance director/counselor	Reports from Optispool Followup of data base	Ongoing monitoring of school data

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
school based activities			\$750.00
			Subtotal: \$750.00
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: \$750.00

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:		no data			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
Data forthcoming		forthcoming			
of the students are economically disadvantaged, thereby, decreasing the likelihood for parental involvement.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Lack of school-to-parent connection	Student recognitions and awards and Open House Newsletters/flyers Child-care assistance during activities Announcements on marquee' Parent Link	Administrators SAC chair Parent committee Guidance director	Increased parental participation in activities	Sign-in log
2	Accuracy of phone numbers and addresses	Update student records	Front desk secretary	Increased parental participation in activities	Sign-in log

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
Topics will include technology, discussion monthly, PLC participation.	All grades, all subjects	Reading coach (Mrs. Carter) Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels)	All faculty, grades, departments, support staff personnel	Early release days: Also monthly Professional development meetings	Teacher monitoring Data chats Review data of mini assessments Lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs	Reading coach (Mrs. Carter) Administrators (Mrs. Talley, Mrs. Humphrey, Mrs. Daniels)

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	school based activities along w/materials for parents		\$750.00
			Subtotal: \$750.00
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: \$750.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

n/a Goal:

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 n/a Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Daily review of vocabulary terms, continued implementation of Next Generation SSS focus and District distributed IFCs.	textbooks		\$1,491.00
CELLA	IPT testing			\$3,000.00
Mathematics	Researched based lessons	textbooks		\$4,840.00
Science	Research based lessons	textbooks		\$901.00
Writing	Research based lessons			\$1,000.00
Attendance	school based activities and incentives			\$600.00
Suspension	school based activities and incentives			\$600.00
Dropout Prevention	school based activities			\$750.00
Parent Involvement	school based activities along w/materials for parents			\$750.00
				Subtotal: \$13,932.00
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	Monday monthly staff development days and early release dates: PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 ER - 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13	conferences	inservice	\$0.00
Mathematics	Monday monthly staff development days and early release dates: PSD - 9/6/12 10/4/12 11/1/12 12/6/13 1/10/13 2/21/13 3/14/13 4/4/13 ER - 9/27/12 10/25/12 1/17/13 2/7/13 3/21/13	conferences		\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$13,932.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority

jn Focus

jn Prevent

jn NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/7/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
	\$2,500.00

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

Discussions will surround SIP, Headstart and Adult Literacy program updates, professional development, school budget and safety, guidance, media, club news, etc.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found