FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MIAMI KILLIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Mr. Thomas P. Ennis

SAC Chair: Mr. Frank Moreno

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mr. Thomas P. Ennis	B.S. Western Kentucky University M.S. Adelphi University Certification-Physical Ed, PE K-8, Educational	2	19	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade P B B C C High Standards Rdg 49% 39 % 40% 37% 53% High Standards Math 56% 74 % 75% 73% 51% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 48% 52% 51% 60% Lrng Gains-Math 56% 74 % 81% 78% 69 % Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 53% 43% 57% 67% Gains-Math-25% 55% 62% 79% 79% 69%
Assis Principal	Mr. Ciro Hidalgo	Degrees: B.S. Science University of Miami M.S. Education, Florida International University	6	9	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade P B B C B High Standards Rdg. 49% 47% 49% 48% 45% High Standards Math 56% 77% 76% 78% 74% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 52% 55% 41% 52%

Position	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record
		Certifications: Educational Leadership Biology 6-12			Lrng Gains-Math 56% 78% 77% 77% 77% Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 52% 44% 48% 47% Gains-Math-25% 55% 70% 67% 60% 69%
Assis Principal	Ms. Courtney Collier	B.S. Math Education Florida A & M University M.S. Educational Leadership Nova University Certifications: Education Leadership Math	3	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade P B F NA D High Standards Rdg. 49% 47% 15% NA 39% High Standards Math 56% 77% 48% NA 28% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 52% 34% NA 58% Lrng Gains-Math 56% 78% 66% NA 64% Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 52% 64% NA 63% Gains-Math-25% 55% 70% 64% NA 81%
Assis Principal	Ms. Madeline Luis	Degrees: B.A. Florida International University M.S. Saint Thomas University Certifications: Educational Leadership Psychology	3	8	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade P B B C B High Standards Rdg. 49% 47% 72% 45% 42% High Standards Math 56% 77% 84% 75% 70% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 52% 68% 36% 51% Lrng Gains-Math 56% 78% 79% 76% 75% Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 52% 63% 49% 52% Gains-Math-25% 55% 70% 63% 67% 68%
Assis Principal	Ms. Niki Flamer	Degrees: B.A. Florida International University M. Ed. Harvard University Ed. D. Florida International University (in progress) Certifications: Educational Leadership English Gifted	5	14	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade P B B C B High Standards Rdg. 49% 47% 49% 48% 45% High Standards Math 56% 77% 76% 78% 74% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 52% 55% 41% 52% Lrng Gains-Math 56% 78% 77% 77% 77% Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 52% 44% 48% 47% Gains-Math-25% 55% 70% 67% 60% 69%

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	Mrs.Brigitte Wong-Green	Degrees: B.A. Business Management Herbert H. Lehman College (CUNY) Certifications: MG English Economics Reading	4	6	'12 '11 '10 '09 School Grade P B B C High Standards Rdg. 49% 47% 49% 48% High Standards Math 56% 77% 76% 78% Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64% 52% 55% 41% Lrng Gains-Math 56% 78% 77% 77% Gains-Rdg-25% 67% 52% 44% 48% Gains-Math-25% 55% 70% 67% 60%

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)

1	1. Placement of student classroom observers and interns	Assistant Principal for Curriculum	Ongoing	
2	2. Regular meetings with new teachers	Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Partnering of early career teachers with veteran teachers	Assistant Principal for Curriculum	September 2012	
4	4. Participation in the Mentoring and Induction for New Teachers (MINT) Program	Professional Development Liaison	September 2012	

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
	Strategies being implemented to support staff in becoming highly effective include: • information provided to targeted teachers regarding preparatory courses for passing subject-area tests; • support from the Reading Coach and/or subject area department chairpersons for targeted teachers and staff; • pairing of targeted teachers and staff with other professionals that are rated as highly effective.

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
127	0.8%(1)	15.7%(20)	44.1%(56)	39.4%(50)	40.9%(52)	62.2%(79)	8.7%(11)	4.7%(6)	15.0%(19)

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
Kaelin, Jennifer		Common subject area	Classroom observations and collaborative planning
Frisby, Nicola		Common subject area	Classroom observations and collaborative planning
Ugaz, Liz		Co-Teaching	Classroom observations and collaborative planning

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

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 MTSS team will include the following individuals:
• Principal- ensures the MTSS Leadership Team meets on a regular basis, functions appropriately allocates resources correctly.
• Assistant Principal for Curriculum- guides the data analysis process, and ensures that it is adequately and appropriately used to develop teaching and learning school wide and ensures professional development aligned to support the implementation of the MTSS.
• Selected General Education and Special Education (SPED) Teachers- provide information about core instruction, participate in student performance data analysis and collaborate with other staff members to ensure understanding of the MTSS.
• Student Services Staff- provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with small groups and/ or individual students.

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

The MTSS team will utilize this process to focus school wide efforts on data collection and analysis to determine which students need which type of assistance, and to continue the cycle of ongoing progress monitoring to ensure that instruction and interventions are being effective. The team will:
1. Evaluate the academic progress of students addressing key questions about student learning.
2. Gather and analyze student performance data to determine professional development needs for faculty,
3. Meet regularly (meetings will be held monthly).
4. Maintain open lines of communication with faculty for input and feedback.
5. Design, implement, and evaluate instruction and interventions.
6. Determine levels of need and student progress.
7. Assist with monitoring responding to the needs of students in selected AMO subgroups.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team members met with their respective departments to review school wide end of year data and to reflect upon the 2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP). The results were shared with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC), and their input was also recorded. The team then met to develop priorities for the 2012-2013 school year, based on the feedback from the total school community. The team provided guidance regarding levels one, two and three of support, helped set priorities for instruction, assisted in determining the master schedule in order to match the most highly qualified teachers with the students in the lowest quartile, and aligned processes and procedures school wide to focus on data-driven instruction. The RtI Leadership Team will monitor this process throughout the school year.

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.

• Reading: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Interim Assessments (IA) through Edusoft Data Management Software, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), as needed, and the Comprehensive English Language Learner Assessment (CELLA), for ELL students
• Mathematics: FCAT, IA through Edusoft Data Management Software
• Writing: Measurement, Inc., Pre-test and Post-test
• Science: FCAT, IA through Edusoft Data Management Software
• Behavior: Daily and Monthly Attendance Reports, Student Case Management System Executive Summary (Product #T32205402), and Student Assistance Profile (Product #T0515P71-01)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All staff will be encouraged to participate in the online MTSS workshop offered through the Center for Professional Learning (CPL), which provides a comprehensive overview of the MTSS process. Professional development will be provided during after school mini-workshops in small sessions, and through ongoing departmental meetings. Also, during Miami Killian Senior High's Opening of School meetings, all MTSS team members will be provided with an overview of the MTSS, along with all scheduled meeting dates for the year. Lastly, MTSS professional development will be provided during early release sessions throughout the school year, and during the two district professional development days.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> The school administrative team will monitor and provide support needed by the MTSS Leadership Team. The school administrative team will provide data reports on an ongoing basis, as well as release time, to ensure that the MTSS Leadership Team has the appropriate documentation required to perform its function.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The LLT will include the following individuals:
> • Principal- Thomas P. Ennis
> • Assistant Principal for Curriculum- Niki E. Flamer
> • Department Chairpersons- Evelyn Alvarado, Catherine Conkling-Wagner, Kimberly Dennis, Jean Hansen, Dr. Michael McGraw, Karen Harper, Fay Weinberg
> • Reading Liaison- Brigitte Wong-Green
> • Program Specialist- Rosa Edgar
> • Test Chairperson- Darma Rodriguez
> • Media Specialist- Myra Dewhurst
> • Magnet Lead Teacher- Monica Perez de Corcho
> • Gifted Consultant- Anmarie Etchart

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

> The LLT will meet monthly. The Assistant Principal for Curriculum and the Reading Liaison will develop the agenda, with input gathered from all curriculum leaders at the school and after reviewing school wide data. The agenda will also include the recommendations of the MTSS, and LLT meetings will address those recommendations in order to provide the necessary support to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
>
> The reading coach will share her expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The Reading Liaison will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The Reading Liaison will provide motivation within the LLT to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms, conferencing with teachers and administrators, and providing professional development.

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

> The LLT will continue to promote the use of data for driving instruction, including data chats amongst staff and between staff and students. Additionally, an increased focus on Differentiated Instruction will be evident in professional discussions, and will be monitored on an ongoing basis by department chairpersons and school administrators. All activities and initiatives of the LLT will be aligned to the K-12 CRRP.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

Teachers across the curriculum contribute to the reading improvement of every student by implementing reading strategies within daily instructional practices to increase student comprehension of content area reading material. All teachers will assess student reading performance data, and will monitor student progress in the area of reading comprehension by tracking student performance on Interim Assessments. Additionally, the Reading Coach will provide instructional support to all teachers in the school to provide professional development and in-class support that will facilitate the use of strategies that promote student reading comprehension in content area disciplines, including a focus on reading application and literary analysis.

*High Schools Only

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

The school offers students elective courses in art, JROTC, music studies, dance, world languages, technology, and career studies, in addition to various honors, Advanced Placement (AP) and Dual Enrollment (DE) courses in various subject areas. These courses focus on job skills and connect academic learning to the real world, and prepare students for transition into postsecondary institutions. A daily focus of the school is for teachers and students to ask each other, "why are we learning this?" to ensure that instruction is always evident and relevant. Teachers also provide students with reading practice exercises that are based on current events and further support the acquisition of reading comprehension and proficiency with a variety of reading material.

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?

The school offers students elective courses in art, JROTC, music studies, dance, world languages, technology, and career studies, in addition to various honors, AP and DE courses in all subject areas. These courses focus on job skills and connect academic learning to the real world, and prepare students for transition into postsecondary institutions. Every year, students and parents participate in a course selection process that exposes them to next year's curriculum to inform their course selection. Incoming freshman, as well as all rising tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students, meet in small groups with counselors for future course and career planning. Parents are also invited to contact the student services staff, and final course selection is sent home for parent approval.

Postsecondary Transition

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

The number of students earning a standard diploma or GED has increased over the past three years, including increases in the percent of graduates who scored at level three or above on the tenth grade FCAT in both Reading and Math, and is higher than both the district and state percentages. This has led to increases in various indicators of college success, for even our struggling students, and has led to increases in our graduation rate. Additionally, Miami Killian Senior High School strives to increase the participation of students in DE courses. As such, we have partnered with Florida International University (FIU) and Miami-Dade College (MDC) to offer DE courses on our school campus, during the school day. A Virtual Learning Lab has also been opened, servicing close to 500 students throughout the course of the day, who are taking an online course as part of their school day. This program has allowed students to experience online instruction while maintaining the support of an instructional staff member at the school site.

Additionally, school site Student Services professionals implement lessons which focus on improving personal effectiveness, planning life after high school, surviving after high school, and succeeding in post-secondary academic and vocational institutions, in the military, and in the world of work. Student services staff meet with students, conduct various college-planning sessions, serve as student advocates in advanced academic programs, and even host night events to ensure the students and parents are well-versed in issues regarding selection of an appropriate institution, financial planning including scholarships and Bright Futures, and in preparing for all other aspects of life after high school.

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 24% of the students achieved at level 3 of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 proficiency by six percentage points, to 30%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (316)	30% (395)

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	1a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 3- Literary Analysis	1a.1. Utilize NGSSS question stems focused on Reporting Category 3 with all practice, quiz, and test questions in all grade nine and ten classes across the curriculum	1a.1. Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons	1a.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	1a.1. Formative: Classroom assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) in Reading by five percentage points for the 2012-2013 school year
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in reading was reading comprehension skills.	1b.1. Incorporate the use of pre-reading strategies (e.g., preview, skimming) on a daily basis.	1b.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	1b.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples , classroom walkthroughs	1b.1. Formative: Classroom assessments Summative:

					Results from the 2013 FAA in Reading
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 24% of the students achieved at levels 4 and 5 of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at level 4 and 5 proficiency by two percentage points, to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (311)	26% (342)

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	2a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application.	2a.1. Increase use of the Reading Plus software program with all students scoring at levels 4 and 5 on a weekly basis to further enrich reading application skills and further enhance fluency.	2a.1. Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons	2a.1. Review of the Reading Plus software program monitoring reports to ensure student completion of learning modules	2a.1 Formative: Reading Plus software program monitoring reports, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

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:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 on the FAA in Reading by three percentage points for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in reading was limited vocabulary.	2b.1. Incorporate lessons specifically geared towards increasing student comprehension of advanced word families and patterns	2b.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	2b.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples , classroom walkthroughs	2b.1. Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Results from the

		amongst students scoring at or above Level 7 on the FAA in Reading.			2013 FAA in Reading

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 65% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students demonstrating learning gains by 5 percentage points, to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (759)	70% (818)

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	3a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 4- Informational Text/Research Process.	3a.1. Follow the school wide instructional focus calendar that emphasizes instruction in processing text (synthesis) and answering cross-curricular questions. Students will respond to NGSSS Informational Text and Research Process question stems during weekly assessments.	3a.1. Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons, and Reading Liaison	3a.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	3a.1. Formative: Classroom assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading
2					

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA in Reading by five percentage points for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	3b.1. The area of deficiency as	3b.1. Provide direct instruction	3b.1. SWD Department	3b.1. Review of lesson plans	3b.1. Formative:

| 1 | noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in reading was limited vocabulary. | in the area of letter/sound relationships by identifying a minimum of letter/sound correspondences. | Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD | and student work samples , classroom walkthroughs | Classroom assessments

Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Reading |

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 69% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase in the
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (219)	74% (235)

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	4a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 4- Informational Text/Research Process.	4a.1. Continue to schedule all reading classes in the Media Center for instruction on Reporting Category 4- - Informational Text/Research Process on a monthly basis, to increase student skills in synthesizing a variety of text structures.	4a.1. Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Reading Department Chairperson, Reading Liaison , and Media Specialist	4a.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	4a.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments, progress monitoring through the Jamestown Reading Navigator program and the FAIR, focused on progress in Reporting Category 4

Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal #

The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 in Reading indicate that 48% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

5A : |
|---|---|

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54	58	63	67	71	

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

	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 27% of students in the Black subgroup achieved

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of Black students achieving proficiency by 18 percentage points, to 45%. The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 51% of students i1 the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of Hispanic students achieving proficiency by eight percentage points, to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black:27% (75) Hispanic:51% (394)	Black:45% (124) Hispanic: 59% (455)

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	5B.1. Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application. Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 3- Literary Analysis.	5B.1. Schedule and conduct data chats between students in the Black and Hispanic subgroups and teachers to review and analyze their individual progress monitoring data. Each student will be made aware of his or her progress on a monthly basis.	5B.1. MTSS Team	5B.1. Conduct departmental and administrative data chats with teachers, review of teacher-student data chat protocols and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	5B.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 17% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (18)	33% (35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 2- Reading Application.	Schedule and conduct data chats between students in the ELL subgroup and teachers to review and analyze their individual progress monitoring data. Each student will be made aware of his or her progress on a monthly basis.	MTSS Team	Conduct departmental and administrative data chats with teachers, review of teacher-student data chat protocols and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction.	Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of students in the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of SWD students achieving proficiency by 14 percentage points, to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (46)	39% (71)

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	5D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 2-Reading Application.	5D.1. Provide push-in and/or pull-out tutoring services for students in the SWD subgroup through the implementation of an inclusion model in classroom instruction. Tutoring will provide students with additional practice to increase their Reading Application skills.	5D.1. Administrative Team, SWD Department Chairperson, Program Specialist, Inclusion Teachers	5D.1. Review of push-in/pull-out tutoring schedule, lesson plans, and classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	5D.1. Formative: Classroom assessments, results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 40% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of ED students achieving proficiency by 11 percentage points, to 51%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (311)	51% (397)

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	5E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT in Reading was Reporting Category 3-Literary Analysis.	5E.1. Schedule and conduct data chats between students in the ED subgroup and teachers to review and analyze their individual progress monitoring data. Each student will be made aware of his or her progress on a monthly basis.	5E.1. MTSS Team	5E.1. Conduct departmental and administrative data chats with teachers, review of teacher-student data chat protocols and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	5E.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading

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
MTSS	9-12	Reading Coach and Reading Department Chairperson	School-wide	October 25, 2012	Informal Classroom Observations	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons
Analyze Data and targeted students (lowest 25%) for Differentiated Instruction	9-12	Department Chairpersons	School-wide	October 2, 2012 November 27, 2012 February 14, 2013	Departmental Data Chats and grade level data chats	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA in Listening/Speaking indicate that 54% of students in the achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

54% (105)

	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	1.1. Students do not listen to and speak English a sufficient number of hours per day to increase their English listening/speaking proficiency.	1.1. Incorporate the usage of audio materials in language arts instruction to include listening to spoken English literature on a weekly basis.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples	1.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA in Listening/Speaking

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA in Reading indicate that 25% of students in the achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

25% (49)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The ability to read in English and comprehend what is being read is limited.	2.1. Continue usage of the Teen Biz program to increase student reading comprehension.	2.1. Principal	2.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples	2.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA in Reading

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA in Writing indicate that 37% of students in the achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

37% (72)

	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	.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA in Writing was expressive writing skills.	3.1. Increase activities that require students to generate their own writing topics (e.g., listing, brainstorming, clustering, discussing topics with others, drawing).	3.1. Principal	3.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples	3.1. Formative: Results from the Interim Assessments, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT in Writing

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in mathematics was problem solving skills.	1.1. Incorporate the use of modeling as a teaching strategy to ensure students understand sorting and classifying objects by one or more attributes.	1.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	1.1 Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	.1. Formative: Student demonstrations and projects, interviews between teacher and student. Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Mathematics

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:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above level 7 on the FAA in mathematics for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in mathematics was number sense.	.1. Provide students with multiple opportunities to practice identifying positive and negative whole numbers in real-world situations.	2.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	2.1 Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Formative: Student demonstrations and projects, interviews between teacher and student.

				Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Mathematics

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.	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the FAA in mathematics for the 2012-2013 school year.
Mathematics Goal #3:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in mathematics was measurement	3.1. Develop instructional activities specific to building an understanding of measurement and applying appropriate units and tools.	3.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	3.1 Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	3.1. Formative: Student demonstrations and projects, interviews between teacher and student. Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Mathematics

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.	The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Examination indicated that 37% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by four percentage points, to 41%, for the 2012-2013 school year.
Algebra Goal #1:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (198)	41% (218)

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
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Exam was Reporting Category 2- Polynomials.	Utilize daily bell ringer activities and the Cognitive Tutor program to increase students' skills in Reporting Category 2- Polynomials.	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Mathematics Department Chairperson	Review of lesson plans and student work samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	Formative: Classroom Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Examination

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:	The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Examination indicated that 8% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by two percentage points, to 10%, for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (45)	10% (53)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC Exam was Reporting Category 3- Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	2.1. Assign students to classroom learning teams to build problem solving capacity when working on problems related to Reporting Category 3- Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics.	2.1. Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Mathematics Department Chairperson	2.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	2.1. Formative: Classroom Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Examination

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Examination indicated that 45% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
		47	52	57	63	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	The results of the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC Examination indicated that 24% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 10 percentage points, to 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (23)	34% (32)

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
3D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Algebra 1 EOC	3D.1. Provide push-in and/or pull-out tutoring services for students in the SWD subgroup through the	3D.1. Administrative Team, SWD Department Chairperson,	3D.1. Review of push-in/pull-out tutoring schedule, lesson plans, and classroom walkthroughs	3D.1. Formative: Classroom assessments, results from the

1	Examination was Reporting Category 3-Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Mathematics for students in the SWD subgroup.	implementation of an inclusion model in classroom instruction. Tutoring will provide students with additional practice to increase their skills in Reporting Category 3 for Algebra 1 students and Reporting Category 2 for Geometry students.	Program Specialist	and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC Examination

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Examination indicated that 20% of students scored in the middle third. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by three percentage points, to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (200)	33% (224)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	1.1. Utilize daily bell ringer activities to increase	1.1. Assistant Principal of Curriculum,	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work	1.1. Formative: Classroom

1	administration of the Baseline Geometry EOC Examination was Reporting Category 2-Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.	students' skills in Reporting Category 2-Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics.	Mathematics Department Chairperson	samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Examination

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:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Geometry EOC Examination indicated that 20% of students scored in the top third. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by two percentage points, to 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (135)	22% (145)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Baseline Geometry EOC was Reporting Category 1- Two-Dimensional Geometry.	2.1. Assign students to classroom learning teams to build problem solving capacity when working on problems related to Reporting Category 1- Two-Dimensional Geometry.	2.1. Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Mathematics Department Chairperson	2.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples and provide feedback to appropriately guide instruction	2.1. Formative: Classroom Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Examination

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :	The results of the 2012 Geometry EOC Baseline Examination indicate that 50% of students scored in the middle and upper third. Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	47	52	57	63	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Geometry EOC Examination indicated that 50% of students scored in the middle and top third. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by five percentage points, to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (335)	55% (369)

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
	3D.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Baseline Geometry EOC was Reporting Category	3D.1. Provide push-in and/or pull-out tutoring services for students in the SWD subgroup through the	3D.1. Administrative Team, SWD Department Chairperson, Program	3D.1. Review of push-in/pull-out tutoring schedule, lesson plans, and classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback	3D.1. Formative: Classroom assessments, results from the Interim

| | 1 | 2-Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics. | implementation of an inclusion model in classroom instruction. Tutoring will provide students with additional practice to increase their skills in Reporting Category 3 for Algebra 1 students and Reporting Category 2 for Geometry students. | Specialist | to appropriately guide instruction | Assessments

Summative: Results from the 2013 Geometry EOC Examination |

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Analyze Data and targeted students (lowest 25%) for Differentiated Instruction	9-12	Department Chairpersons	School-wide	October 2, 2012 November 27, 2012 February 14, 2013	Departmental Data Chats and grade level data chats	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons
Cognitive Tutor	9-10	Cognitive Tutor representative	Alg. 1 & Geo math teachers	July 26 , 2012	Informal Classroom Observations	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons
MTSS	9-12	Reading Liaison and Reading Department Chairperson	School-wide	October 25, 2012	Informal Classroom Observations	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons

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
1.1, 3E.1	Cognitive Tutor	School funds	$9,000.00
			Subtotal: $9,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $9,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA in science by five percentage points, from 71% to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (12)	76% (13)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in science was making inferences.	1.1. Provide direct instruction in the use of problem solving strategies like eliminating possibilities and evaluating information.	1.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Science

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:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above level 7on the FAA in science by three percentage points, from 18% to 21%.			
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	18% (3)	21% (4)			
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in science was the application of the scientific method.	2.1. Develop cue cards which outline, in written or pictorial form, major procedural steps, to increase student understanding of the scientific method.	2.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	2.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Science

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:	The results of the 2012 Baseline Biology EOC Examination indicated that 29% of students scored in the middle third. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by four percentage points, to 33%.			
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	29% (178)	33% (201)			
	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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Baseline Biology EOC was Reporting Category 2- Molecular and Cellular Biology.	1.1. Utilize daily bell ringer activities, scientific thinking and critical reading skills to increase students' skills in Reporting Category 2- Molecular and Cellular Biology.	1.1. Assistant Principal for Science, Science Department Chairperson	1.1. Review results of Interim Assessments	1.1. Formative: Classroom Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 Biology EOC Examination

	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:		The results of the 2012 Baseline Biology EOC Examination indicated that 18% of students scored in the top third. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by two percentage points, to 20%.		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	18% (112)		20% (122)		
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Baseline Biology EOC was Reporting Category 2- Molecular and Cellular Biology.	2.1. Increase the usage of Gizmos and Discovery Learning activities in classroom instruction.	2.1. Assistant Principal for Science, Science Department Chairperson	2.1. Review results of Interim Assessments and Gizmos usage data	2.1. Formative: Classroom Assessments, Results from the Interim Assessments, Gizmos monthly usage reports Summative: Results from the 2013 Biology EOC Examination

---

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
Analyze Data and targeted students (lowest 25%) for Differentiated Instruction	9-12	Department Chairpersons	School-wide	October 2, 2012 November 27, 2012 February 14, 2013	Departmental Data Chats and grade level data chats	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons
Discovery Learning	9-12	Department Leader for Discovery Learning	School-wide	November 6, 2012	Informal classroom observations	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons

---

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

2.1	Discovery Learning	School funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: $2,000.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Writing Test indicated that 95% of the students scored at Level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher, at 95%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95% (640)	95% (640)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was support.	1.1. Use the Measurement Inc., writing program to assess students' persuasive and expository writing skills and to provide targeted instruction on support.	1.1. Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Language Arts Department Chairperson	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, and review of Measurement Inc. assessment results	1.1. Formative: Measurement Inc. assessments, online textbook essay grader, classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Writing Test

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.	Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 4

	Writing Goal #1b:		or higher on the FAA in writing.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FAA in Writing was expressive writing skills.	1b.1. Increase activities that require students to generate their own writing topics (e.g., listing, brainstorming, clustering, discussing topics with others, drawing).	2b.1. SWD Department Chairperson, Assistant Principal for SWD	2b.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	2b.1. Formative: Classroom assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA in Writing

---

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
Measurement Inc.	9-10	Measurement Inc. Representative	9-10 English Teachers	September 17, 2012	Classroom Visitations, Reviews of student writing portfolios	Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Language Arts Department Chairperson

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1a.1	Measurement Inc.	EESAC Funds	$11,000.00
		Subtotal: $11,000.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $11,000.00

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for at least 10% of the students taking the Baseline US History EOC to score in the top third.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (48)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The area of deficiency is expected to be in Reporting Category 2-Global Military, Political, and Economic Challenges	1.1. Implement the use of a departmental curriculum focus calendar to target instruction on reading strategies and the interpretation of graphs and charts, to increase comprehension of Global Military, Political, and Economic Challenges.	1.1. Social Studies Department Chairperson, Assistant. Principle for Social Studies	1.1. Review results of Interim Assessment, review of lesson plans and student work samples, departmental curriculum focus calendar	1.1. Formative: classroom assessments Summative: Results from the Baseline 2013 US History EOC Examination

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is for at least 10% of the students taking the Baseline US History EOC to score in the top third.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (48)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

| 1 | The area of deficiency is expected to be in Reporting Category 1- U.S. History: Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century. | Incorporate the use of primary source documents in daily instruction to increase student analytical thinking and interpretation of primary source documents. | Social Studies Department Chairperson, Assistant. Principle for Social Studies | Review results of Interim Assessment, review of lesson plans and student work samples | Formative: classroom assessments

Summative: Results from the Baseline 2013 US History EOC Examination |

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
Using Edusoft to Analyze US History EOC Examination Interim Assessment data	11	Israel Andrews	US History Teachers	October 25, 2012	Data Chats	Administrative Team

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	A review of 2010-2011 school wide data indicated that 94.46% of students were in attendance on average. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students present by one-half of a percentage point, to 94.96%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.59% (2720)	94.96% (2872)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
1332	1265
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
948	901

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	1.1. Students with health-related, emotionally-related, or other contributory factors, do not attend school on a regular basis.	1.1. Teachers and administrators will identify and implement intervention services with students who are developing a pattern of non-attendance.	1.1. Administrator over Attendance, School Social Worker	1.1. Review of attendance records	1.1. Attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	9-12	Assistant Principal over Attendance, School Social Worker	Teachers, counselors, and attendance personnel	October 27, 2012	Truancy intervention plan. Assistant Principal over Attendance will monitor implementation.	Assistant Principal, School Social Worker

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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:	A review of the 2011-2012 school wide data indicated that 1562 in-school suspensions occurred. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the number of in-school suspensions, to 1406. A review of the 2011-2012 school wide data indicated that 272 out-of-school suspensions occurred. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1562	1406
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
729	656
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
272	245
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
203	183
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	1.1. Parents are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct and unaware of the reasons for their child's suspension. Students demonstrate an inability to effectively resolved personal/ social/ emotional out-of-school conflicts and/or interpersonal conflicts.	1.1. Develop and implement a school wide discipline plan that is in alignment with the Student Code of Conduct. Inform teachers, students, and parents of the discipline plan through orientation and parent meetings, ConnectED messages, and the school website. Provide additional support through counseling for students exhibiting signs of emotional distress.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Monitor ConnectED message logs, student services logs, and parent contact logs for evidence of communication	1.1. ConnectED message logs, Student Services logs, Parent communication logs, Parent sign-in logs, parent meeting agendas, student orientation agenda

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
Student Code of Conduct Policies and Procedures	9-12	Administrative Team	School wide	October 27, 2012	Review data for students who have been placed on indoor and/or outdoor suspension.	Administrative Team

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct and School-Wide Discipline Plan	School Funds	$50.00
1.2	Detention Coordinator	School Funds	$4,000.00
		Subtotal: $4,050.00	
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:	$4,050.00

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	A review of 2011-2012 school wide data indicated that the graduation rate was 78.2%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the graduation rate by two percentage points, to 80.2%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
. 1.44% (42)	1.37% (40)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
78.2% (615)	80.2% (631)

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	1.1. At-risk students are not enrolling in alternative programs because they are unmotivated and often unaware of their options for ensuring graduation	1.1. Conduct parent conferences with students in danger of failing and out of phase students to ensure that course credit recovery options are provided and being utilized by students.	1.1. Administrative Team, Student Services Department Chairperson	1.1. Review of Student Services Parent Contact logs and enrollment in alternative programs	1.1. 2013 Graduation Rate

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	A review of 2011-2012 school climate data indicated that only 64% of parents had positive perceptions regarding the overall climate. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents with positive perceptions by five percentage points, to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
64% (83)	69% (89)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	1.1. Lack of participation in school wide academic activities by parents	1.1. Increase communication via web site postings, newsletters, and ConnectED messages , to inform parents of school events.	1.1. Administrative Team, Activities Director	1.1. Review of web site and ConnectED usage log	1.1. Web site and ConnectED usage log

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teacher Web Sites	9-12	Assistant Principal over Technology	Teachers	January 17, 2013	Review of teacher web sites	Assistant Principal over Technology

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	A review of the master schedule reflects that only five percent of the student population is currently

	STEM Goal #1:		participating in Advanced Placement (AP) mathematics courses, and only six percent of the student population is currently participating in AP science courses.		

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	1.1. Students exhibit anxiety regarding their preparedness for enrolling in and successful completion of AP mathematics and science courses.	1.1. Increase AP preparation strategies in pre-AP courses, focusing on the use of project-based learning activities and competitions such as David Fairchild Challenge and Science Fair, to ensure students have the necessary pre-requisite skills to be successful in AP courses and to alleviate anxiety regarding advanced mathematics and science instruction.	1.1. Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Mathematics Department Chairperson, Science Department Chairperson	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Review of the number of students enrolling in AP mathematics and science courses.

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
Mentoring Pre-AP Teachers	Mathematics and science teachers	AP Teachers	10	November 6, 2012	Informal Classroom Observations	Administrative Team, Department Chairpersons

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:	Based on 2011-2012 data, the number of students retained in CTE programs was 26. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase that number by 10%, to 29.

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	1.1. Students choosing to enroll in other electives rather than continuing enrollment in CTE courses beyond the first year.	1.1. Increase the use of hands-on activities in all CTE courses in order to motivate students to re-enroll in CTE courses beyond the first year.	1.1. Assistant Principal for CTE	1.1. Review of lesson plans and student work samples, classroom walkthroughts	1.1 The number of students choosing to re-enroll in a CTE course beyond the first year

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	2.1	Discovery Learning	School funds	$2,000.00
Writing	1a.1	Measurement Inc.	EESAC Funds	$11,000.00
Suspension	1.1	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct and School-Wide Discipline Plan	School Funds	$50.00
Suspension	1.2	Detention Coordinator	School Funds	$4,000.00
				Subtotal: $17,050.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	1.1, 3E.1	Cognitive Tutor	School funds	$9,000.00
				Subtotal: $9,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $26,050.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
The EESAC will use annual funds to support school improvement through the funding of Measurement Inc., the writing program.	$11,000.00

The EESAC has the sole responsibility for developing and monitoring the School Improvement Plan on an ongoing basis throughout the school year, using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). The EESAC will also make recommendations for the disbursement of EESAC funds to increase student achievement.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
MIAMI KILLIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	47%	77%	80%	54%	258	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	52%	78%			130	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	52% (YES)	70% (YES)			122	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					520	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
MIAMI KILLIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	49%	76%	89%	44%	258	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	55%	77%			132	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	44% (NO)	67% (YES)			111	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					511	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested