

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: KEYS CENTER

District Name: Monroe

Principal: Melanie Stefanowicz

SAC Chair: Chuck Licis

Superintendent: Mark T. Porter

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 11/6/2012

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

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)
		Modified Educational Leadership from the Florida State University; Masters in the Art of Teaching from Notre Dame University; Bachelor of Arts in			2011-2012 Report Card - Grade Pending 2010-2011 Florida Report Card-B Reading Mastery: 63% Math Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 44% Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: 90% 2009-2010 Grade Pending Reading mastery: 55%, Math mastery: 79%, Writing mastery: 86%, Science mastery: 42%, AYP: White, Hispanic, Economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities were students who did not make AYP in reading. AYP: Hispanic, Economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities are students who did not make AYP in math. 2008-2009 Grade C: Reading Mastery: 56%, Math Mastery: 78%, Writing Mastery: 89%, Science Mastery: 39%, AYP: 79%,

Principal	Melanie Stefanowicz	Communications from Goucher College; Bachelor of Arts in Theatre from Goucher College. Certificate Areas: Educational Leadership K-12 English/Language Arts 6-12 ESE K-12 ESOL K-12	.4	.4	White, Black, Hispanic, and SWD did not make AYP in reading; Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. 2007-2008: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 56%, Math Mastery: 78%, Writing Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 55%. AYP: 77%, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic, Economically disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math. 2006-2007: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 50% Math Mastery: 76%, Writing Mastery: 76%, Science Mastery: 48%. AYP: 79%, Hispanic and Economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. All subgroups made AYP in math. 2005-2006: Grade C: Reading Mastery: 47%, Math Mastery: 70%, Writing Mastery: 82%. AYP: 67%: Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.
-----------	---------------------	---	----	----	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Layne Goldman	Juris Doctorate, BA, FL Teaching Certification: Reading Endorsement, ESOL Endorsement, Integrated Middle School, Social Sciences 6-12	4	3	8 out of 9 of eligible KCA students graduated with their cohort SY 11/12. JJEEP (Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program) Exemplary status on State QA Review for 5 consecutive years.
Data	Xiaohui Sandy Ashwell	Specialist Degree in Educational leadership Master's Degree in Special Education Bachelor's Degree in Education Varying Exceptionalities (K-12) ESOL (K-12) Educational Leadership (K-12) Integrated Curriculum (5-9) Math (5-9) Elementary Education (k-6)	.4	8	School Grade: NA 2010-2012 ACE: Taught Algebra and Geometry—100% of students made learning gains (AYP) in FCAT math in 2011. School Grade: C 2009-2010 Glynn Archer Elementary: Team taught 3rd grade and 5th grade—100% made AYP and learning gains in math and reading for 3rd grade. School Grade: A 2008-2009 Sugarloaf School: Taught 6th grade math, 3rd in the district, 17% increase in FCAT math for level and above. 89% of students made learning gains. School Grade: A 2005-2008 Lamar Louise Curry Middle School (Miami-Dade County): Assistant principal (curriculum, internal accounts, property control, and plant operation, ESE and ESOL) #1 in the school district for all secondary school, for FCAT student achievement three years consecutively. (There are 367 schools in Miami-Dade)

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	Ongoing Professional Development will be provided to support transitioning.	Principal	Ongoing	

2	Candidates will be screened and interviewed based on their application submitted in the PATS system.	Principal	Ongoing	
3	Participation in district New & Beginning Teacher Program	PD Coordinator	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
NA	NA

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
4	0.0%(0)	50.0%(2)	50.0%(2)	0.0%(0)	50.0%(2)	100.0%(4)	25.0%(1)	0.0%(0)	75.0%(3)

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
None	NA	NA	NA

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.

The seven KCA faculty members of this small alternative education program comprise the RtI Leadership Team.

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 RtI approach is an integral component of the KCA successful strategies implemented to make learning gains and recover credit for the struggling student population. Each student develops an individualized Graduation Plan and sets weekly goals in support of graduation. Staff is assigned a caseload of students for whom they are primarily responsible in regard to academic success and they meet weekly with those students to monitor and strategize. The KCA staff also holds weekly student case management meetings to review outcomes and plan strategies for individual students as a cohesive group. Coaching for both academics and counseling is on-going.

KCA staff participates in the Student Services Team at Key West High School and provides follow-up transition activities when a student returns to Key West High School.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Leadership Team also functions as the case management team. Due to the small number of students at this

alternative education site, the group data is not statistically significant. The entire focus is analyzing SIP data on an individual basis and to focus intervention(s) on individual students. The SIP is implemented in an integrated model since the teachers and staff plan and process as a student-focused team.

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 Performance Matters management system is being utilized to review both FCAT and benchmark assessment data respectively. FAIR reading data is provided through the PMRN. There is a behavior management system in place and data is recorded daily, reviewed weekly. KCA students set weekly academic and behavioral goals and meet individually with assigned staff to monitor progress and adjust strategies. These meetings provide an excellent forum for teacher - student data chats.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Current staff has been previously trained in both MTSS and RtI.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI approach is an integral component of the KCA successful strategies implemented to make learning gains and recover credit for the struggling student population. Each student develops an individualized Graduation Plan and sets weekly goals in support of graduation. Staff is assigned a caseload of students for whom they are primarily responsible in regard to academic success and they meet weekly with those students to monitor and strategize using the performance data available. The KCA staff also holds weekly student case management meetings to review outcomes and plan strategies for individual students as a cohesive group. Coaching for both academics and counseling is on-going.

KCA staff participates in the Student Services Team at Key West High School and provides follow-up transition activities when a student returns to Key West High.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The KCA Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of

Melanie Stefanowicz - Principal
Layne Goldman - Reading Coach (FL Reading Endorsed Reading Teacher))
Cathy Sembert - English, Science and Health Teacher
John Grimesey - History & Social Sciences
Sandy Ashwell - Data Coach, Math, and Science Teacher

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

The LLT functions as the instructional faculty of the school and reading is integrated into every subject area. The instructional faculty meets every other week and specifically addresses reading assessment data, both formal and informal. Instructional planning is thematic and strategies are collectively employed.

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

The major initiatives of LLT for this school year include

- focusing on vocabulary development in all subject areas
- reading novels relevant and motivational for adolescent girls
- utilizing media resources for research
- participating in guest speaker and other community-based opportunities

*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.

Reading is integrated into every subject area. The instructional faculty meets every other week and specifically addresses reading assessment data, both formal and informal. Reading goals are incorporated into individual student Graduation Plans.

*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?

Instructional planning is thematic and strategies are collectively employed. Student engagement is a priority at KCA so life application of knowledge is frequently utilized as a motivational factor.

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?

Every KCA student develops a Graduation Plan which includes both academic and career goals. With assistance from the KCA Guidance Counselor and Reading Coach, students gauge their completion status on graduation requirements and develop first and second semester schedules for the school year (both core courses and electives). Weekly meetings are scheduled between students and their staff mentors as well as with their Take Stock In Children (TSIC) mentors for those students participating in TSIC. KCA has been able to offer a variety of electives since every teacher is HQ in more than one area. The Guidance Department meets with individual classes and conducts student course selections in conjunction with the major areas of interest.

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](#)

We offer a guidance component that focuses on CHOICES in conjunction with specific lessons offered on college and career readiness. KCA students are encouraged to take the CPT (College Placement Test). Students participate in weekly guidance meetings and mentoring meetings to facilitate goal-oriented discussions centered on post-secondary plans.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Minimum 60% (6) of the students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3/4/5) in Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 students achieved proficiency	60% (6) will achieve proficiency

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	Low student attendance	Attendance Plan- High expectations will be set at the beginning of the year for attendance. Ongoing tracking of attendance through the District Truancy Committee and school staff will take place. Professional Administrative attendance rewards, and initiatives to improve student attendance.	School faculty, counselors, administrators, and MCSD Truancy Coordinator	Attendance monitoring and tracking	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT scores for 9th-11th grade if available. ACT scores for 11-12th graders.
2	Lack of Parental Support	Parent communication to gain parent support, data chats/counseling with students using FCAT, FAIR and Performance Matters progress monitoring data, grades and attendance records.	School faculty and administration	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Also, teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.
3	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide reading initiative using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, complex materials. Also, use of targeted differentiated and CRISS strategies across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.	School faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.

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.	NA				
Reading Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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.	30% (4) of KCA students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4/5) in reading.
Reading Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% achieved above proficiency	30% (4) will achieve above proficiency

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 parental support.	Improve parental communication especially in the area of grades, attendance, and performance using FAIR , FCAT, and progress monitoring data.	School Faculty	Teacher, guidance, and administration parent contact records.	Grades, attendance, FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring data.
2	Lack of student attendance	School-wide attendance initiatives with incentives implemented by teachers and n administrators.	School Faculty and Administration	Analysis of school attendance records and student grades.	Grades, FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring
3	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide incentive-based reading program, using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, rigorous materials. Also, use of targeted reading and Springboard strategies across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.	School Faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.
	History of not achieving to full potential due to	Build resiliency factors and reduce risk factors,	Life Skills Counselor and Faculty	Goal setting and weekly monitoring	FCAT 2012

4	exhibiting multiple risk factors and few resiliency factors	close progress monitoring, provide challenging and rich curriculum, set high expectations, reinforce effort and positive outcomes		
---	---	---	--	--

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:	NA
--	----

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

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	50% of the KCA students will make learning gains in reading as defined by the FL DOE
---	--

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

25% (4) making learning gains	50% (6) making 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	Basic skills deficits due to gaps in skill development and lack of continuity in quality instruction, low expectations.	Differentiate instruction and organize time efficiently to diagnose skill deficits and remediate accordingly.	Reading and Data Coaches	Frequent progress monitoring, track prescriptive teaching and specific skill acquisition	FAIR, Performance Matters progress monitoring, and EDGE formative and summative curriculum assessments.
2	Basic skills deficits due to gaps in skill development and lack of continuity in quality instruction, low expectations	Differentiate instruction and organize time efficiently to diagnose skill deficits and remediate accordingly	Faculty	Frequent progress monitoring, track prescriptive teaching and specific skill acquisition	FAIR, Performance Matters progress monitoring, and EDGE formative and summative curriculum 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 reading. Reading Goal #3b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	80% (2) of KCA students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains as defined by FL DOE
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2) made learning gains	80% (2) will make learning gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Non-proficiency in vocabulary, comprehension and fluency	Extended class time, individual student plans to include weekly reading goals, provide resources to parents	Reading and Data Coaches	Progress monitoring, tracking data, discussing data with students and parents	FAIR, Performance Matters progress monitoring
2	Learning disability in the area of reading	Implement IEP strategies, utilize high interest/low level reading resources, targeted skill focus groups			

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 #					
	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.					
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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
**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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	**NA	**NA	**NA	**NA	**NA

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:	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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
Response to Instruction/Intervention RtI Springboard Training AVID Strategies	9-12 core content subject areas and reading classes	District specialists, reading coach, principal	Faculty and staff members	Thursday staff meetings, early release professional development days, and district PD offerings	Review of RtI data, PD follow-up activities, teacher-created lesson plans.	Principal

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	
CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

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:	NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
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
No Data Submitted				

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

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
No Data Submitted				

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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
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 #
5A :

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making

satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:		NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.
---	--

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

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:			Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:			Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:		Though Keys Center Academy does not have a sufficient number of students to create a subgroup, individual student needs will be addressed through strategies described in other SIP goals.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

End of High 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:		100% (2) of students will achieve proficiency levels on the Algebra 1 EOC.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		100% (2) of students will achieve proficiency levels on the Algebra 1 EOC.			
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	Low student attendance	Attendance Plan- High expectations will be set at the beginning of the year for attendance. Ongoing tracking of attendance through the District Truancy Committee and school staff will take place. Professional Administrative attendance rewards, and initiatives to improve student attendance.	School faculty, counselors, administrators, and MCSD Truancy Coordinator	Attendance monitoring and tracking	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT scores for 9th-11th grade if available. ACT scores for 11-12th graders.
2	Lack of Parental Support	Parent communication to gain parent support, data chats/counseling with students using FCAT, FAIR and Performance Matters	School faculty and administration	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Also, teacher observation of student progress and	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT

		progress monitoring data, grades and attendance records.		grades.	and ACT scores as appropriate.
3	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide reading initiative using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, complex materials. Also, use of targeted differentiated and CRISS strategies across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.	School faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.

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:	50% (1) of students will score at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	50% (1) of students will score at or above achievement level 4 in Algebra 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
1	Lack of student attendance	School-wide attendance initiatives with incentives implemented by teachers and n administrators.	School Faculty and Administration	Analysis of school attendance records and student grades.	Grades, FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring
2	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide incentive-based reading program, using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, rigorous materials. Also, use of targeted reading and Springboard strategies across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.	School Faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.
3	Lack of critical thinking skills and math vocabulary	Incorporate higher level questions, maintain math notebooks, utilize interactive courseware resources, engage students with math	Faculty Members	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessments.	End-of-Course Exam and Performance Matters Progress Monitoring.

		challenge of the day			
4	Lack of prerequisite arithmetic skills	Daily drill challenges, use of projector/white boards/interactive on-line resources and manipulatives for active student engagement	Faculty Members	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessments.	End-of-Course Exam and Performance Matters Progress Monitoring.

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:	100% (2) of students will score at an achievement level of 3 on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	100% (2) of students will score at an achievement level of 3 on the Geometry EOC.

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	Low student attendance	Attendance Plan- High expectations will be set at the beginning of the year for attendance. Ongoing tracking of attendance through the District Truancy Committee and school staff will take place. Professional Administrative attendance rewards, and initiatives to improve student attendance.	School faculty, counselors, administrators, and MCS D Truancy Coordinator	Attendance monitoring and tracking	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT scores for 9th-11th grade if available. ACT scores for 11-12th graders.
2	Lack of Parental Support	Parent communication to gain parent support, data chats/counseling with students using FCAT, FAIR and Performance Matters progress monitoring data, grades and attendance records.	School faculty and administration	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Also, teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.
3	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide reading initiative using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, complex materials. Also, use of targeted differentiated and CRISS strategies	School faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.

		across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.			
4	Lack of critical thinking skills and math vocabulary	Incorporate higher level questions, maintain math notebooks, utilize interactive courseware resources, engage students with math challenge of the day	Faculty	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessments.	End-of-Course exams and Performance Matters progress monitoring.
5	Lack of prerequisite arithmetic skills	Daily drill challenges, use of projector/white boards/interactive on-line resources and manipulatives for active student engagement	Faculty	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessments.	End-of-Course exams and Performance Matters progress monitoring.

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:	50% (1) student will score at or above achievement level 4 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	50% (1) student will score at or above achievement level 4 in Geometry.

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 parental support.	Improve parental communication especially in the area of grades, attendance, and performance using FAIR , FCAT, and progress monitoring data.	School Faculty	Teacher, guidance, and administration parent contact records.	Grades, attendance, FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring data.
2	Lack of student attendance	School-wide attendance initiatives with incentives implemented by teachers and n administrators.	School Faculty and Administration	Analysis of school attendance records and student grades.	Grades, FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring
3	Lack of reading ability in students	FCAT Practice and tutoring, school-wide incentive-based reading program, using Cornell Notes and annotated reading strategies, and FCAT passages school-wide to expose students to high level, rigorous materials. Also, use of targeted reading and Springboard strategies across content areas to raise student achievement and provide differentiated instruction.	School Faculty	Analysis of collected data from FAIR, progress monitoring, and CWTs. Teacher observation of student progress and grades.	FCAT, FAIR, and Progress Monitoring, PSAT for 9-12th graders as appropriate. SAT and ACT scores as appropriate.

4	Lack of critical thinking skills and math vocabulary	Incorporate higher level questions, maintain math notebooks, utilize interactive courseware resources, engage students with math challenge of the day	School Faculty	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessment data.	Performance Matters progress monitoring assessments, End-of-Course exams
5	Lack of prerequisite arithmetic skills	Daily drill challenges, use of projector/white boards/interactive on-line resources and manipulatives for active student engagement	School Faculty	CWTs, lesson plan review, formative and summative assessment data.	Performance Matters progress monitoring assessments, End-of-Course exams

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
Response to Instruction / Intervention	High School / Algebra 1 and Geometry	District RtI Coach	School-wide Faculty	Thursday staff meetings	Review student RtI Data Charts	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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:	NA
---	----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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
No Data Submitted				

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 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:	NA
---	----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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
No Data Submitted				

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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				

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	100% (3) of students will score at an achievement level 3 in biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	100% (3) of students will score at an achievement level 3 in biology.

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	KCA does not have adequate access to Science lab/equipment	Maximize on-line resources (including Brain Pop, Gizmos), collaborate with Key West High Science teachers to share resources, offer Marine Science and utilize FKCC resources	Faculty members	Monitor on-line Science courses, review teacher-created lesson plans, formative and summative assessments.	Biology End-of-course exam and Performance Matters progress monitoring 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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement	
---	--

Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	33% (1) of students will score at or above achievement level 4 in biology.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
NA	33% (1) of students will score at or above achievement level 4 in biology.				
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	Planning practices may not necessarily focus on differentiation for the high achieving students	Provide rigorous and relevant Science instruction to challenge all students to achieve to their potential	School faculty	Review of lesson plans, Performance Matters progress monitoring assessment data, and formative and summative assessments.	Biology End-of-Course exam.

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
Response to Instruction / Intervention	10th grade Biology	District RtI Coach	School-wide Faculty	Thursday staff meetings	Review student RtI Data Charts	Principal

Science Budget:

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

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:		100% (4) of KCA students tested in Writing will score 3.0 and above on FCAT Writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
83% (5) scored in the proficient range.		100% (4) of KCA students tested in Writing will score 3.0 and above on 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	Limited opportunity to apply writing skills on a regular basis.	Promote writing-rich classroom environment. Engage students in writing opportunities. Maintain notebooks and journals - writing every day. Weekly FCAT Writing prompts for all students. Writing assignments in every subject area. Include writing assignments in all research classes.	Faculty	Teacher-facilitated peer reviews	FCAT Writes test and periodic progress monitoring.

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:		33% of students will score at 4 or higher on the FCAT writes test.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
16% of students scored at a 4 or higher on the FCAT writes test in 2011-2012.		33% of students will score at 4 or higher on the FCAT writes 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
	Limited opportunity to apply writing skills on a regular basis.	Promote writing-rich classroom environment. Engage students in writing opportunities. Maintain notebooks and	Faculty	Teacher-facilitated peer reviews	FCAT Writes test and periodic progress monitoring.

1	journals - writing every day. Weekly FCAT Writing prompts for all students. Writing assignments in every subject area. Include writing assignments in all research classes.		
---	---	--	--

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
Response to Instruction / Intervention	10th grade English/Language Arts	District curriculum supervisor, reading coach, principal	School-wide faculty	Thursday staff meetings, Springboard trainings, early release professional development days.	Review of performance data, RTI data charts, formative and summative assessments.	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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:	KCA will increase attendance rate by 10% for SY 10/11
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
84.4%	98.16%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
4	2
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
13	6

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	Low student engagement	Positive Behavior Support support activities, including breakfast for students arriving on time and following expected checking in procedures (to include securing cell phones) Additional attendance incentives are incorporated on a weekly and monthly basis. Attendance goals are included in each student's Graduation Plan. Each staff member is responsible for making parent contact on a weekly basis for a small group of students. KCA Counselor works to resolve attendance issues, including home visits and frequent communication with parent(s).	All Staff	Track and monitor attendance and tardiness daily	20-day Attendance Reports, Pinnacle average daily attendance

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
Response to Intervention /Attendance	High School / Attendance	District RtI Coach	School - wide staff	Thursday staff meetings	Review attendance RtI data charts	Counselor, reading coach, principal

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:	There will be less than 10 student out-of-school suspensions at KCA over the course of the 12/13 SY
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	Less than 10

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
Not Available	Less than 10				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
Not Available	Less than 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	Suspensions are often not productive or relevant	Express clear expectations and establish a comprehensive and consistent behavior management system, Work through issues and deescalate concerns	Principal	On-going documentation of behavior management system, record of suspensions	TERMS SESIR reporting

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
Response to Intervention / Discipline	High Schol / Discipline	District Rtl Coaches	Faculty and staff	Thursday staff meetings	Review discipline Rtl charts	Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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>	KCA will demonstrate a 1.4% decrease in the dropout rate for the 10/11 SY
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
3.4 %	2.0 %
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
66.7%	75%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	KCA is an Alternative Education program for students at high risk of dropping out of school	Implement KCA program model with high fidelity; Provide individualized academic and counseling services for students demonstrating multiple risk factors and minimal resiliency factors	Principal	Maintain individual Graduation Plans	Dropout Rate, Graduation Rate, Credit Recovery Rate

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Response to Instruction / Intervention / Academics and Behavior	High School / Behavior Management	District RTI Coordinator	School-wide staff	Thursday staff meetings	Utilize RtI data charts to document progression in behavior management system	Principal
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---	-----------

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		100% of KCA parents will participate in school activities a minimum of one time per semester			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
100% of parents participated in at least one school activity		100% of parents will participate in at least two school activities over the course of the SY			
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
	Many parents work multiple jobs and have little time available to meet	Maintain initial interview practice involving parents. Offer multiple opportunities for	All staff headed by Heather Jennings	Maintain logs of parent activity opportunities	Parent sign-in sheets

1	parents to participate in student recognition ceremonies, student performances, community partnership activities, volunteer activities, teacher conferences and home visits. Maintain open communication lines and establish a schedule of rotating staff contact, provide family counseling sessions as appropriate			
---	--	--	--	--

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
Response to Instruction / Intervention	High School / Academics and Behavior	Principal and counselor	Faculty	Thursday staff meetings and family information nights	Share RtI data charts with parents	Principal

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:		100% (15) of students will become proficient in applying specific STEM and 21st century literacy skills in core content academic classes.			
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 physical plant and classroom space and a need for high quality professional development in target STEM and 21st century literacy skills.	Working to locate a new site. Participating in district-offered STEM PD.	Principal	Review of lesson plans.	Summative assessments.

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
STEM and 21st century literacy skills	9-12 core content areas	District curriculum supervisors	School-wide faculty	Professional development offered by school district. Technology Expo in January 2013	Review of lesson plans and summative assessments of targeted skills.	Principal

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

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:		30% of students will apply learned workplace skills in an on-the-job training (OJT) class.			
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	Transportation	Locate and teach students the public transportation opportunities available to them in their communities.	Faculty and counselor	Review of employer feedback	Employer evaluations

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
CTE workforce development strategies	9-12 High School	District curriculum supervisor	Faculty	Thursday staff meetings	Staff meeting notes and data collected from student employers	Principal

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)

Counseling Services Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Counseling Services Goal Counseling Services Goal #1:		Risk factors (as researched by National Dropout Prevention Center) will be significantly reduced for 90% of the students		
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
90%		90%		
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
Response to Intervention / Counseling	High School / Counseling	Counselor	Faculty and Staff	Thursday staff meetings	Share quarterly reports of progress on increasing resiliency factors and decreasing risk factors with staff	Counselor and Principal

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 Counseling Services Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

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
Positive Behavior Support	\$0.00

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

The SAC has been established, has had two meetings to date and has monthly meetings scheduled over the course of the school year. SAC members have expressed desire to be actively involved this school year in planning and providing support and appreciation activities for staff and students. SAC members are also bringing in volunteers to provide enrichment activities for

students and plan to participate in student recognition and graduation ceremonies.

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