FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ATHENIAN ACADEMY OF PASCO COUNTY

District Name: Pasco

Principal: Dr. Fern Aefsky

SAC Chair: Ray Allen

Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino

Date of School Board Approval: NA

Last Modified on: 9/10/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Fern Aefsky	Ed.D. Educational Leadership M.Ed. Preschool Disabilities B.S. Elementary & Special Education	1	24	

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Recruit: The School advertises & recruits through teacher to teacher.com. All applicants are screened, verified and references checked through a comprehensive intervicew process	HR	Ongoing	
2	2. Teachers are provided with professional development opportunities that assist them in developing strong knowledge base in assessment, curriculum, instruction and student management.	Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Teachers are assigned job responsibilities that are consistent with certification, experience and knowledge in order to improve student success.	Principal	Continual	

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
27	7.4%(2)	55.6%(15)	37.0%(10)	7.4%(2)	25.9%(7)	92.6%(25)	11.1%(3)	0.0%(0)	44.4%(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
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

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.

Dr. Fern Aefsky, Principal
Melissa Mangino, ESE Teacher

Rita Ritchie 3rd grade teacher
Kathleen Willis, Speech/Language Pathologist

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

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team is responsible for scheduling and running TBIT and SBIT meetings, gathering data in a central location (ESE office), maintaining and updating Request for Intervention Teacher and TBIT Worksheets, scheduling appropriate Tier I,II or III intervention times for students and assigning appropriate staff, and evaluating interventions for fidelity and efficacy. The MTSS Leadership Team interfaces with the school-based Literacy Leadership Team and the school-based Math Liaison to develop training materials and interventions for Tier I, II and III students. The MTSS team further interfaces with the School Psychologist, District Staffing and Compliance Supervisor, Social Worker, and School Nurse during regularly scheduled SBIT meetings and In-School Staffing meetings to review processes and to evaluate student data.
The school-based MTSS Leadership Team participates in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan by providing organized data which demonstrate patterns of school-wide, grade-wide and subgroup-based responses to interventions and potential areas of need to be addressed on the School Improvement Plan.

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 MTSS Leadership Team will analyze current data including demographic, school-wide achievement data and disaggregated data to make recommendations for the School Improvement Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

The primary data sources utilized to summarize data at each tier for various subject areas are as follows:
K-5 6-8
Reading FAIR
FCAT (3-5) / SAT (K-2)
Treasures/Triumphs Fluency assessment measures
Weekly Treasures/Triumphs
Selection Tests and FCAT-format tests FAIR
FCAT

Mathematics Core K-12
Pre-Test/Post-Test Core K-12
Pre-Test/Post-Test
Science n/a Core K-12
Pre-Test/Post-Test
Writing FCAT (3-5)
Timed Writing Samples FCAT
Timed Writing Samples
Behavior ABC Data Collection Form
Anecdotal Records
Behavior Frequency Count
Behavior Duration Chart
Behavior Latency Chart
Behavior Scatter Plot
Interval Sampling Recording
Momentary Time Sampling ABC Data Collection Form
Anecdotal Records
Behavior Frequency Count
Behavior Duration Chart
Behavior Latency Chart
Behavior Scatter Plot
Interval Sampling Recording

Momentary Time Sampling

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained on MTSS in a turnkey method, using members of the MTSS Leadership team. Training will occur during professional development days, staff meetings, and during TBIT meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Coverage will be provided for teachers while attending MTSS meetings. Grade level meetings will be held to discuss student progress in MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following members:
Dr. Fern Aefsky, Principal
Melissa Mangino, ESE Teacher
Kara Bonney, Middle School Reading Teacher
Danielle Johnson, Grade2 Teacher
William Avtgis, Middle School Reading Teacher

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

The Lead Literacy Team will meet monthly as needed to discuss curriculum, instructional technology, strategy instruction, and to develop and implement turnkey training opportunities.

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

The major initiative of the Lead Literacy Team this year is training staff on CPS technology in conjunction with reading series assessments in order to facilitate data-informed instruction and an understanding of data gathered.

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.

AAP has developed an integrated curriculum where reading skills and strategies are developed in all curriculum areas.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	2012 FCAT data results indicated that 26.2% of students in grades 3-8 scored a level 3 proficiency in reading. Literacy skills as well cross-curricular vocabulary development will be continually developed. Additionally, common assessments will be administered across all grade levels using CPS and Examview technology to more accurately monitor student progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% of students in grades 3-8 scored a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 2012 reading FCAT.	By 2013 a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the FCAT will be achieved by 80% of our students in grades 3-8.

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	Use of new technology for teachers requires ongoing training and supervision to ensure consistent use of available technology	Increased use of technology in all classrooms to integrate and record student achievement	teachers principal	record frequency of technology used through evaluation process, student assessment components	curriculum based assessments; teacher evalautions
2	Developing an effective plan for turnkey trianing in order to maintain effective instruction	Increase training opportunities for all teachers in new curriculum	teachers; principal	Track professional development trainings, outcome and use	quarterly 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 group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	35.7% of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 35.7% of students in grades 3-8 scored a level 4 or 5 in reading.	By 2013, 45% of students in grades 3-8 will score a 4 or 5 on the FCAT reading test.

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	Differentiating instruction in a consistent manner in order to provide enrichment activities for students	create opportunities for students through creative sccheduling	principal; teachers	6 week evaluation of project based learning activities	teacher evalautions; student products
2				continuous progress monitoring	FAIR McMillan McGraw Hill Weekly Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In 2012,61% of students in grades 4-8 made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Based on the 2012 FCAT,61% of students in grades 4-8 made learning gains in reading.	By 2013,80% of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling conflicts; engagement of students for longer periods of time used effectively for increased student achievment.	All students are scheduled for additional literacy instruction each day.	teachers, principal	Continuous progress monitoring data collection of student achievement.	FAIR, McGraw Hill Weekly Skills Assessment and pacing charts
2					

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	44% of students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in reading as measured by FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	In 2013, 55% of students in the lowest 25% wil make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		Students scoring in the lowest 25% will receive	Teachers	Continuous progress monitoring	PMRN toolkit assessments, FAIR

1		additional reading interventions within the MTSS framework.			assessment, McGraw-Hill weekly skills assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Learning gains will be increased from 5 to 10 percent each year to reach an overall goal of 80% proficiency in reading by all students.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61%	65%	70%	75%	80%	

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:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 59% of white students scored proficiently in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 59% of white students scored a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test.	By 2013, 80% of students in this subgroup will score a level 3 or higher in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Students scoring in the low to moderate range will receive 45 minutes of intervention daily	teachers, principal	Continous progress monitoring	McGraw Hill Weekly Skills Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 24% of ELL students made proficiency on the Reading section of FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
na	In the year 2013, 70% of ELL students will make proficiency on the Reading section of FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

2		Students scoring in the low to moderate range will receive additional interventions within the MTSS framework.	Kara Bonney, teachers	continuous progress monitoring	FAIR, weekly assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 33% of students with disabilities scored at a level 3 or higher in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to 2012 FCAT data, 33% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficiency in reading.	By 2013, 50% of students with disabilities will score at a level 3 or higher in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Students scoring in the low to moderate range will continue to receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework in addition to ESE interventions if needed.	teachers, ESE teachers	continuous progress monitoring	FAIR assessments, PMRN toolkit assessments, McGraw-Hill weekly skills assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Based on 2012 FCAT data,52% students in this subgroup did not achieve proficiency in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 48% of economically disadvantaged students scored at a level 3 or higher in reading.	By 2012, 80% of economically disadvantaged students will score a level 3 or higher on the reading FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Students scoring in the low to moderate range will receive additional interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	FAIR assessments,PMRNtoolkit assessments, McGraw-Hill weekly skills assessments
2		Students scoring in the low or moderate range with receive 45 minutes of interventions daily	teachers	Continuous Progress Monitoring	McGraw Hill Weekly Assessment Skill Tests, FCAT assessment

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
Training on reading series' Examview along with CPS technology.	K-8	Kara Bonney, William Avtgis	K-8 teachers, intervention teachers and administration	September 2012	as needed	Fern Aefsky
Continued implementationof MTSS	K-8	MTSS Leadership Team	K-8 teachers, intervention teachers	Faculty and grade level meetings	Analysis of lesson plans for differentiated instructional strategies.	Fern Aefsky
Increase in amount of teachers working towards their reading endorsementandESOL endorsement.	K-8	Pasco Schools District facilitator	K-8 teachers	June 2012	HR office	Fern Aefsky

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase of new social studies curriculum integrating technology and literacy activities.	TCI Social Studies series		$24,000.00
			Subtotal: $24,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase of additional technology to support reading curriculum and instruction.	Additional CPS clickers, lcd projectors,laptops		$6,500.00
			Subtotal: $6,500.00
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
Update and additional purchase of reading materials	Update and additional purchase of McGraw Hill Treasures reading material		$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
			Grand Total: $33,500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Based on 2012 CELLA data 73% of ELL students were proficient on the Listening/Speaking section.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
By the year 2013, 80% of ELL students will be proficient on the Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA. We will continue to support county and state regulations.	

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	According to 2012 CELLA data, 65% of ELL students made proficiency on the Reading section of the CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
By the year 2013, 75% of ELL students will make proficiency on the Reading section of the CELLA. We will also continue to support county and state regulations.	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	According to 2012 CELLA data, 79% of ELL students made proficiency on the Writing section of the CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
By the year 2013, 80% of ELL students will make proficiency on the Writing portion of the CELLA. We will also continue to support county and state regulations.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary 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:	In 2012, 43% of students in grades 6-8 scored at or above a level 3 on the mathematics FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 43% of students in grades 6-8 achieved math proficiency.	By 2013, 80% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the mathematics FCAT.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Use of new technology for teachers requires ongoing training and supervision to ensure consistent use of available technology</td><td>Increased use of technology in all classrooms to integrate and record student achievement</td><td>teachers principal</td><td>record frequency of technology used through evaluation process, student assessment components</td><td>curriculum based assessments; teacher evalautions</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Developing an effective plan for turnkey trianing in order to maintain effective instruction</td><td>Increase training opportunities for all teachers in new curriculum</td><td>teachers;principal</td><td>Track professional development trainings, outcome and use</td><td>quarterly reports</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td></td><td>School will offer math nights and tutoring for parents and students to increase their test scores.</td><td>Sacha Demby, Christina Wood, Barbara Cinelli</td><td>Continous progress monitoring</td><td>Weekly Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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:	Twenty percent of our students in grades 3-5 scored a 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT math test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 20% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above a level 4 in mathematics.	By 2013, 30% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Mathematics test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Differentiating instruction in a consistent manner in order to provide enrichment activities for students</td><td>create opportunities for students through creative sccheduling</td><td>principal; teachers</td><td>6 week evaluation of project based learning activities</td><td>teacher evalautions; student products</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>According to classroom observations, the Next Generation SSS are higher and more in depth than in prior years.</td><td>School will offer math clinics for parents and students to help increase test scores.</td><td>Leah Alderfer, Christina Wood,</td><td>Continous Progress Monitoring</td><td>Weekly Assessments, CORE K-12 Tests</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 60% of our students made learning gains in mathematics.

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

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
	According to 2012 FCAT data, 60% students made learning gains in Mathematics.		In 2013, 80% of students tested will make learning gains in mathematics.	

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		School will offer family math literacy night for parents and students to help increase student outcomes	Sacha Demby, Christina Wood,	Continous Progress Monitoring	Weekly Assessments
2		Students will receive additional math interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	Continous Progress Monitoring	Weekly Assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 FCAT data indicates that 58% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 58% of student made learning gains in math based on the FCAT.	In 2013, 80% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

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	The new generation sunshine standards include objectives that involve higher level thinking and analytical skills.	School will intergrate math vocabulary and standards into other areas of core curriculum to enhance student performance	teachers	Continous Progress Monitoring	Weekly Assessments

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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Learning gains in mathematics will increase by 5% each year with a goal of 80% of students proficient in math by 2016. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	

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:	Math proficiency was not achieved in all subgroups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Math proficiency was not achieved in all subgroups.	By 2013, all subgroups will meet proficiency criteria.

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		School will offer family math night to include parents in math skill development taught to students; additional time will be spent on mathematics instruction through enhanced technology	teachers	Continous progress monitoring	Weekly Assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 24% of ELL students made proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to 2012 FCAT data, 24% of ELL students made proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.	By the year 2013, 70% of ELL students will make proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Students scoring below the moderate range will receive additional interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	chapter tests and mid-chapter evaluations

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:	According to FCAT 2012 data, 45% of Students with disabilities scored at a level 3 or higher in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2012 math FCAT.	By 2013, 70% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the mathematics FCAT.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	Students scoring in the low to moderate range in math will receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	Weekly assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 48% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 achieved math proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 48% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT.	By 2013, 75% of students in this subgroup will score a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT.

		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 score in the low to moderate range will receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	Continous Progress Monitoring	Weekly assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In 2012, 43% of students in grades 6-8 scored at or above a level 3 on the mathematics FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 43% of students in grades 6-8 achieved math proficiency.	By 2013, 80% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the mathematics FCAT.

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	Use of new technology for teachers requires ongoing training and supervision to ensure consistent use of available technology	Increased use of technology in all classrooms to integrate and record student achievement	teachers principal	record frequency of technology used through evaluation process, student assessment components	curriculum based assessments; teacher evalautions
2	Developing an effective plan for turnkey trianing in order to maintain effective instruction	Increase training opportunities for all teachers in new curriculum	teachers; principal	Track professional development trainings, outcome and use	quarterly 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 group:

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	Twenty percent of our students in grades 3-5 scored a 4 or

Mathematics Goal #2a:		5 on the 2012 FCAT math test.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 20% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above a level 4 in mathematics.		By 2013, 30% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Mathematics test.		

	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	Differentiating instruction in a consistent manner in order to provide enrichment activities for students	create opportunities for students through creative sccheduling	principal; teachers	6 week evaluation of project based learning activities	teacher evalautions; student products

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 60% of our students made learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to 2012 FCAT data, 60% students made learning gains in Mathematics.	In 2013, 80% of students tested will make learning gains in mathematics.

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		Students scoring at low to moderate levels will receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	Weekly assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 FCAT data indicates that 58% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 58% of student made learning gains in math based on the FCAT.	In 2013, 80% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The sunshine state standards include objectives that involve higher level thinking and analytical skills.	School will intergrate math vocabulary and standards into other areas of core curriculum to enhance student performance.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	weekly assessments

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	Middle School Mathematics Goal # Learning gains will increase by 5% each year to reach a goal of 80% proficiency in math by all students in 2016.

by 50%.

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	

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:	Math proficiency was not achieved in all subgroups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Math proficiency was not achieved in all subgroups.	By 2013, all subgroups will meet proficiency criteria.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td></td><td>School will offer family math night to include parents in math skill development taught to students; addtional time will be spent on mathematics instruction through enhanced technology.</td><td>teachers</td><td>continuous progress monitoring</td><td>weekly assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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 2012 FCAT data, 24% of ELL students made proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to 2012 FCAT data, 24% of ELL students made proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.	By the year 2013, 70% of ELL students will make proficiency on the Mathematics section of FCAT.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

5A :

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:

According to FCAT 2012 data, 45% of Students with disabilities scored at a level 3 or higher in math.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the 2012 math FCAT.	By 2013, 70% of students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Students scoring in the low to moderate range will receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	weekly assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	According to 2012 FCAT data, 48% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 achieved math proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 48% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT.	By 2013, 75% of students in this subgroup will score a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT.

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 score in the low to moderate range will receive extra interventions within the MTSS framework.	teachers	continuous progress monitoring	Weekly assessments

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	Last year 4 middle school students participated in algebra end of course exams and passed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 3 8th grade and 1 7th grade students participated in Algebra end of course exams.	By 2013 we expect an increase in students participating in Algebra EOC exams.

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

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

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

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	

Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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:	In 2012, no students participated in Geometry EOC exams.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, no students participated in Geometry EOC exams.	In 2013 we expect that more students will participate in Geometry EOC exams.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training on math series' Examview along with CPS technology	K-8	Kara Bonney, William Avtgis	K-8 teachers	September 2012	as needed	Fern Aefsky
Continued implementation of MTSS	K-8	MTSS Leadership Team	K-8 teachers, intervention teachers	Faculty & grade level meetings	Analysis of lesson plans for differentiated instructional strategies	Fern Aefsky

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Update and purchase of additional mathematics materials to further overall math instruction.	Update and additional purchase of GO Math materials.		$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase of additional technology to support math instruction.	CPS clickers, lcd projectors, laptops		$6,500.00
			Subtotal: $6,500.00

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: $9,500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	For students scoring a level three and above in Science, the goal is to improve proficiency levels by providing enhanced opportunities for students through hands on learning experiences.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% of 5th graders scored at or above proficiency levels and 37% of the 8th graders scored at or above proficiency levels.	For the 2013 Science FCAT, Athenian Academy expects that 80% of the students will score a level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
1	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Use of new technology for teachers requires ongoing training and supervision to ensure consistent use of available technology	Increased use of technology in all classrooms to integrate and record student achievement	teachers principal	record frequency of technology used through evaluation process, student assessment components	curriculum based assessments; teacher evalautions
2	Developing an effective plan for turnkey trianing in order to maintain effective instruction	Increase training opportunities for all teachers in new curriculum	teachers;principal	Track professional development trainings, outcome and use	quarterly 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 group:

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Very few students ing grades 5 and 8 scored a 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 35% of students in grades 5 and 8 scored proficiently on the science FCAT.	In 2013, Athenian Academy expects a 30% increase in level 4 or level 5 students and it is expected that 75% of students will score a level 3 or higher.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Differentiating instruction in a consistent manner in order to provide	create opportunities for students through creative sccheduling	principal; teachers	6 week evaluation of project based learning activities	teacher evalautions; student products

enrichment activities for students	

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Continued training on Science Fusion series, common vocabulary as identified by FLDOE	K-8	Principal and science teachers	all teachers	quarterly meetings, faculty and grade level meetings	student achievement, lesson plans, report cards	Fern Aefsky

---

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Update and additional purchase of science materials.	Update and additional purchase of Science Fusion series materials as needed.		$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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students in grades 4 and 8 scored significantly lower on the 2012 writing FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 29% of 4th graders scored proficiently in writing, a drop of 33% from the prior year. Fifteen percent of 8th graders scored proficiently, a drop of 69% from the prior year.	For 2013, 80% of students in grades 4 and 8 will score a 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Writing expectations must be consistent	Ongoing conversation about writing across curriculum areas will be a year-long goal	teachers	Continous Progress Monitoring	student progress reports, report cards; teacher lesson plans
2	Writing rubrics, scoring and instruction has been inconsistent across grade levels.	Common writing vocabulary and rubrics will be used across all grade levels and content areas.	all teachers	Grade level meetings,Common rubrics across grade levels (K-2,3-5,6-8)	student work, teacher lesson plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Shared vocabulary and written expectations/ rubrics acorss grade levels and content areas.	K-8	Principal, teachers	all teachers	grade level meetings	continuous progress monitoring	Fern Aefsky

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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:	For the 2012-13 school year, it is expected that all students will attend school on a consistent basis.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
NA	na
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
na	na
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
na	na
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	Excessive absences decreases student achievement, in all measured areas of student achievemenChallenging home situations impact student attendance.	Increase the amount of students that use Athenian Academy's bus service. Utilization of school connect messages to inform families of absences. Consistent information presented to parents in varied ways to discuss the importance of regular attendance.	Beverly McKinney	monitor daily attendance	TERMS School Connects report

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Suspension is a serious consequence and will be utilized appropriately for students.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
13	10
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
na	na
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
51	25
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
na	na

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Create positive behavior intervention framework and character educaiton program (Circle of Courage)	Staff, principal	continuous progress monitioring through student incentive programs	TERMS

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Parent Involvement is a critical component of our school program. During the 2012-2013 school year, parents will be encouraged to become members of our PTO, volunteer in our classrooms and school wide programs, and get involved with our SAC committee.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2012 our school had a fair amount of parental involvement within the school.	In 2013, our parental involvement will continue to increase.

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
Parents will be invited to curriculum nights to increase their awareness of academic expectations.	K-8	principal	teachers, parents, administration	October 2,3,4 2012	parent sign in sheets	Fern Aefsky

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Purchase of new social studies curriculum integrating technology and literacy activities.	TCI Social Studies series		$24,000.00
Mathematics	Update and purchase of additional mathematics materials to further overall math instruction.	Update and additional purchase of GO Math materials.		$3,000.00
Science	Update and additional purchase of science materials.	Update and additional purchase of Science Fusion series materials as needed.		$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $30,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Purchase of additional technology to support reading curriculum and instruction.	Additional CPS clickers, lcd projectors,laptops		$6,500.00
Mathematics	Purchase of additional technology to support math instruction.	CPS clickers, lcd projectors, laptops		$6,500.00
				Subtotal: $13,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Update and additional purchase of reading materials	Update and additional purchase of McGraw Hill Treasures reading material		$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $3,000.00
				Grand Total: $46,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/9/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business

and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

During quarterly meetings, SAC will assist in developing student achievement goals as well as the school improvement plan. Our SAC will also identify instructional technology needs.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Pasco School District
ATHENIAN ACADEMY OF PASCO COUNTY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	63%	68%	50%	257	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	67%	62%			129	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	73% (YES)			136	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					522	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Pasco School District
ATHENIAN ACADEMY OF PASCO COUNTY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	71%	76%	58%	281	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	69%			138	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	67% (YES)			134	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested