

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: LETO HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Hillsborough

Principal: Victor Fernandez

SAC Chair: Stephanie Tate/ Darlene Sigle Lam

Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Lauren Otero	B.S. Masters in Ed Leadership	4	6	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Assis Principal	Marcus Asgedom	B.S. Masters in Ed Leadership	16	10	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Principal	Victor Fernandez	B.A. Masters in Administration and Supervision	4	18	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Assis Principal	Evanita Omensetter	B.S. Masters in Atheletic Training Masters in Educational Leadership	10	1	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Assis Principal	Walter Balsler	B.A. Masters in Teaching and Learning Masters in Ed Leasership	4	4	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
		B.S.in Education and Chemistry			11-12:

Assis Principal	Hilda Genco	Masters in Educational Leadership	1	9	10-11: B 85% AYP (Sickles HS) 09-10: A 79% AYP (Sickles HS)
-----------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	---	---	--

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	Marie Hickman	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Reading K-12	30	30	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Reading	Kera Pask	B.S. ESE Education; Reading K-12;	13	1	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Mathematics	Stephanie Tate	B.S. Mathematics Education	14	1	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Writing	Deborah Van Pelt	B.A. in Journalism M.A. in Journalism M.A. in English Literature	10	3	11-12: 10-11: C 72% AYP 09-10: C 74% AYP
Science	Nigel Jagoo	B.S. Biology	1	1	11-12: 10-11: B 79% (Alonso HS) 09-10: B 77% (Alonso HS)

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	Salary Differential	General of Federal Programs	ongoing	
2	Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	
3	1. Teacher Interview Day	District Staff	June	
4	Recruitment Fairs	District Staff	June	
5	District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
6	School-Based Teacher Recognition Program	Principal	ongoing	
7	Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Teachers: 4	<p>of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.</p> <p>Administrators Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers <p>• Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s)</p> <p>Academic Coach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis <p>Subject Area Leader/PLC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.
-------------	---

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
116	3.4%(4)	26.7%(31)	49.1%(57)	20.7%(24)	37.1%(43)	96.6%(112)	12.9%(15)	4.3%(5)	18.1%(21)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Claire Kelly, EET mentor	Tiffany Gregory - First Year Teacher	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Claire Kelly, EET mentor	Henry Bryson - First Year Teacher	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
		The district-based mentor	

Claire Kelly, EET mentor	Eric Milis - First Year Teacher	is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Claire Kelly, EET mentor	Megan Podsiad - First Year Teacher	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.

Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.

Title II

The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners

Title X- Homeless

The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations

Job Training

Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Leadership team includes:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Assistant Principal for Administration
- Guidance Counselor
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker
- Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis),
- ESE teacher
- Department Heads (High)
- SAC Chair
- ELP Coordinator
- ELL Representative

Not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose for the meeting

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 purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The Leadership team meets regularly. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP

goals

- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
 - o Implementation and support of PLCs
 - o Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
 - o Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
 - o Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
 - o Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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 Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
 - o Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
 1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
 2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
 3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
 4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
 - o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
 - o Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
 - o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
 - o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
 - o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).
 - o Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
 - o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
 - o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
 1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
 2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
 3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
 4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
 5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

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.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RTI Committee/RTI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RTI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RTI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RTI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RTI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RTI as they become available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RTI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Reading Teachers
- Media Specialist
- Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
- Language Arts Subject Area Leaders

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

The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies goals and strategies identified on the SIP.

The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers,

staff members, parents and students.

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
- Professional Development
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

*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.

The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered. A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science and language arts) Project CRISS close reading model lesson follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.

Demonstration classroom opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site. The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.

A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site. The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member, guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year. The RLT should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.

Each PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs. PLCs are responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan-Do-Check-Act) with their core curriculum and acting on the data by providing additional instruction where needed. Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.

Reading coaches are responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.

All costs incurred for reading professional development at the school sites (stipends, consultant contracts, substitutes, materials) are paid for by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan funds.

*High Schools Only

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

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

Courses and coursework are established in Small Learning Communities, Professional Learning Communities, Career

Academies, Career Pathways, Program Completers, the Magnet Program and AVID classes to help students see the relationships both cross-curricular and within subjects to establish relevance to a student's future. Many of these programs help guide and establish a student for post secondary readiness (Industry Certifications, College credit, job skills, etc).

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?

Leto High School will hold an elective fair with present and incoming students. Based on interest, they will establish Course Selection Sheets and courses offerings to best meet their needs. The Guidance Department, ESE Specialist, AVID Coordinator, Department Heads, teachers and APCs will then articulate with feeder schools and assist students in signing up for courses and programs based on their Automatic Course Requests and their individual interests. Guidance Counselors will visit classes to review the curriculum guide and course descriptions. They will distribute Course Selection Sheets and provide information about selecting courses for the following school year. These Course Selection Sheets are then sent home for parent review and signature.

On an annual basis, Leto High School will review new course offerings at the state and district level to continue to offer rigorous and relevant coursework and to meet the State Standards.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

Leto High School has reflected over our High School Feedback Report Trends for 2008-2010. The following is a summary from our annual analysis.

Leto High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum has increased from 35.9% to 43.8% over a three year period, a 7.9% increase. During that same time period, the district increased by 1.5% (64.2% - 65.7%) and the state by 2.3% (57.9% - 60.2%). The number of students taking the PSAT in 2010 was higher than the state average by 12.4%.

Strategies for Improving Student Readiness for Postsecondary:

District-Level

The Career and Technical Education (CTE) Department provides our counselors with a binder and data base of the Programs of Study to help guide students with their educational pathway. The Program of Study maps out the courses and timeline for students to be program completers and successfully transition to postsecondary institutions.

Our district provides a variety of opportunities for students to learn about career pathways at postsecondary institutions through programs such as:

- Career Seeking and Investigations - Provides 8th grade students an opportunity to explore the campus of Hillsborough Community College (HCC) and experience campus life and activities
- Amazing Race - Provides 12th grade students an opportunity to gather enrollment requirements, scholarship opportunities and program offerings for incoming college freshmen
- Hi-Tec Trek - Provides 11th graders with an opportunity to explore Hillsborough County's postsecondary technical centers career and program opportunities.

Additionally, the Hillsborough County Career Pathways Consortium coordinates articulation agreements to provide Career and Technical Education Program Completers with free credit at postsecondary institutions across the state of Florida.

School-Level

Specifically at Leto High School, students may participate in the following:

- College Visits - Various college representatives visit Leto High School to share information about their specific colleges or universities with students.
- ASVAB - Students interested in possibly enlisting in the military are given an opportunity to take this aptitude test.
- USF Senior Access Day - Disadvantaged and underrepresented students are invited to visit USF and learn about careers in various health professions.
- Ready to Work - Students in 12th grade have the opportunity to complete three assessments in the areas of math, reading and interpreting data on the computer in the Success Center. After completing the assessments students are sent a certificate that indicates their scores and the correlating skills. The students then show this certificate to an employer when applying for a job, which makes them more marketable.
- Senior Night - All seniors are encouraged to attend senior night, where they receive their senior handbook and the counselors share valuable information about their senior year. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what seniors should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc.
- Junior Night - Juniors and their parents are given their Junior Handbooks and important information about testing and senior year is shared. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what they should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc.
- Through the AVID program, students are engaged in on-going college readiness activities.

- College Night – District offers four college nights throughout the county for students to speak directly with over 100 college and university representatives.
- All targeted juniors take the PERT. Based on the results, students are placed in college readiness coursework provided to graduation.

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 percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 31% to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%	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	1.3. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. 5) the CIS instructional model Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -Social Studies Logs -Elective Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.	-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

			-Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	
--	--	--	---	--

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:	The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (9)	93%

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		See Reading Goal 5d			

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 percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 13% to 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%	21%

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
	- Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. - Training all content area teachers	Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2)	Who - Principal - AP - Instruction Coaches - Subject Area Leaders - PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How - Reading Logs - Language Arts Logs	Teacher Level - Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. - Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. - Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.	3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

1		<p>asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</p> <p>Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Studies Logs - Elective Logs - PLCs turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. - PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. - Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs - Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. - Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation. 	<p>PLC Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. - PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. - Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
---	--	---	--	--

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:

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

<p>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #3a:</p>	<p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 60 points to 65 points.</p>
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60 points	65 points

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	-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	<p>3.1. Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? <p>Actions/Details -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>Who -Principal -AP - Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p>How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, department head, and/or leadership team.	<p>3x per year FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>
	<p>Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. - Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc</p>	<p>Strategy/Task Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p>Actions/Details Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new</p>	<p>Who -Principal -AP - Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p>How -PLC logs turned into administration, SAL and/or coaches. -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after</p>	<p>Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. - Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. - Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all</p>	<p>3x per year FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>

2	<p>content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques <p>PLCs After Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. <p>(Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs. 	<p>a unit of instruction is complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. 	<p>classes/courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.
---	--	---	---

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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #4:</p>	<p>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69 points to 73 points.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

69 points

73 points

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	<p>Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis.</p> <p>- Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.</p>	<p>Leadership Team and Coach</p> <p>-The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.</p> <p>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:</p> <p>-- Review log and work accomplished and</p> <p>-- Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.</p>	<p>Who Administration</p> <p>How-</p> <p>-Review of coach's log</p> <p>-Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers.</p> <p>-Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)</p>	<p>Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs.</p> <p>-Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs)</p> <p>-Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks</p>	<p>3x per year</p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p>During the Grading Period</p> <p>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>
2	<p>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.</p> <p>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>Strategy</p> <p>Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.</p> <p>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>-Students attend ELP sessions.</p> <p>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.</p> <p>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>	<p>Who Administrators</p> <p>How Monitored</p> <p>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation</p>	<p>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students</p>	<p>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators)</p>

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

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

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black/ Af.American students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 27% to 34%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 27% to 34%. The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 49% to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 27% Hispanic 27% White 49%	Black 34% Hispanic 34% White 54%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Goals 1, 3, and 4			

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 13% to 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%	22%

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
	Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.	ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students. Action Steps -Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas	Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used	-FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance

1		<p>of listening/speaking, reading and writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders 		<p>to drive future instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) 	
---	--	--	--	--	--

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:

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5D:</p>	<p>The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 16% to 24%.</p>				
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>				
<p>16%</p>	<p>24%</p>				
<p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>					
	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>

1

<p>-Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons</p>	<p>Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>- FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>
<p>Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.</p>	<p>Strategy/Task SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. Actions Plan For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we</p>	<p>Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.</p>	<p>Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>

implement for our SWD?
 -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn?
 -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson?
 -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?
 -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?

Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit.

For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:

-What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?

-What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?

-For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?

What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?

-For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?

-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding?

And/or analysis of student performance?

-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?

Reflect/Check – Analyze Data

Discuss one or more of the following:

-What is the SWD data?

-What is the data telling us as individual teachers?

-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?

-What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring?

-Which SWD are learning?

Act on the Data

After data analysis,

	develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?	
--	--	--

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 percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%	37%

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		See Reading Goals 1,2,and 3			

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SWD Co-Teaching	Grades 9-10	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Department Head
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	Grades 9-10	Reading Coach and Department Head	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Department Head
Designing and						

Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	Grades 9-10	Reading Coach and Department Head	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Department Head
Gradual Release Model	Grades 9-10	Reading Coach and Department Head	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Department Head

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.		The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 60% to 63%.			
CELLA Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
60% (306)					
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		See Reading Goals 1,2 and 3			

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 15% to 18%.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

15% (348)

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		See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4			

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 30% to 33%.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

30% (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		See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4			

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:	The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4-9 on the 2013 FAA math will increase from 90% to 93%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90%(10)	93%(12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning.	-Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. Strategy Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -This year, the like-course PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be identified/generated prior to the teaching of the unit.	-Principal -AP -Math Coach -Department Head -PLC facilitators	PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction - Use of formative data to drive student instruction	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period Common assessments

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black/ Af.American students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 37% to 43%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 37%	Black 43%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See math goals 1,2 and 3			

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 32% to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%	39%

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		See math goals 1,2 and 3			

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
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:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	
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 High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 21% to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21%	30%

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
	-Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	-Student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. -	Who? -Principal -APC -Math Coach -Department Head	-PLCs will review unit assessments. -FCIM's will be chosen by looking at formative assessment results.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams

1			How Monitored? -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.		FCIM Assessments
2	-Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students)	-Teachers incorporate DI strategies discussed in PLC discussions	Who? -Principal -APC -Math Coach -Department Head How Monitored? -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	-PLCs will review unit assessments. -FCIM's will be chosen by looking at formative assessment results.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams FCIM Assessments
3	-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.	At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.	Who -Principal -APC -Math Coach -Department Head How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	-PLCs will review unit assessments. -FCIM's will be chosen by looking at formative assessment results.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams FCIM Assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.
Algebra Goal #2:

The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 2% to 9%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2%

9%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.	-Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. - PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.	Who -Principal -APC -Math Coach -Department Head How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	-PLCs will review unit assessments. -FCIM's will be chosen by looking at formative assessment results.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams FCIM Assessments
2	- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	-Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. - PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.	Who -Principal -APC -Math Coach -Department Head How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration	-PLCs will review unit assessments. -FCIM's will be chosen by looking at formative assessment results.	2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams FCIM Assessments

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:		The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 69% to 73%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
69%		73%			
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		See Algebra Goals 1, 2 and 3			

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:		The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 23% to 26%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
23%		26%			
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		See Algebra Goals 1, 2, and 3			

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCIM training	9-12	Donna DeSena	And FCIM course (Algebra and Geometry)	October 5, 2012	Math Coach and Department Head will follow up with FCIM assessment results	Department Head, Math Coach, APC
HOTS	9-12	On the ground coaches	Any math teacher	September 24, 2012	Math Coach will follow up with modeling	Math Coach/ APC/ on the ground math coaches
SpringBoard online	9-12	Math Coach	Any SpringBoard math course	October 8th, 2012	Math Coach will review SpringBoard Online	Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 percentage of students scoring in the middle and upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 51% to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (476)	54%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. Low reading levels – Students are not fluent and have not developed true metacognitive skills to comprehend content based questions.	1.1. All biology teachers will employ the Comprehension Instruction Model (CIS) model for each biology unit to increase reading fluency within the	1.1. Who: The Principal, APC, Department chair , Science coach and PLC teachers How:	1.1. Teachers will evaluate Mini-Assessment and Formative Test data and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80%	1.1. • District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons • District Unit Mini Assessments

1		content area. Teachers are working together to develop lessons in both Spanish and English to bridge the language gap. With the help of bilingual aides, increased efforts to connect with stakeholders will be implemented to help motivate ELL students to attend ELP tutoring.	A complete evaluation of Formative Test data to progress monitor the identified bottom quartile students. ELP attendance list will be submitted to APC on a weekly basis to monitor those students who are attending.	mastery on units of instruction. Teachers will collaborate to form common assessments. Teachers will employ 'Checks for understanding' within their lesson plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FCIM quizzes • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data • Gizmos
2	1.2. Differentiated Instruction: Not all teachers have developed effective 5E lesson planning skills and instruction is not differentiated enough.	1.2. Teachers will meet once per week in their PLCs to develop common effective 5E lessons. These lessons will include 'Checks for understanding' and Higher Order Thinking (HOT) questions. Teachers will employ FCIMs on a daily basis to remediate benchmarks. Science coach will work one-on-one with teachers to develop effective 5E Lessons.	1.2. Who: Science coach & Department head How: A PLC log will be kept by the science coach and lessons developed will be shared with the entire department. Mini assessments will be used to inform the FCIM process.	1.2. Administrators conducting walk-throughs will look for implementation of strategies and correlate effective reading strategies to Mini-assessment data. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers use the common formative assessment data, common unit assessment data, common checks for understanding data, and Achievement Series data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC	1.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons • District Unit Mini Assessments • FCIM quizzes • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data
3	1.3. PLCs only meet once per month	1.3. Voluntary PLCs are held once per week.	1.3. Site science coach, District science coach and Department head will attend weekly PLCs.	1.3. PLC logs PLCs will reflect on lesson outcomes and data use to drive future lessons.	1.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • District Unit Mini Assessments • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data
4	Training: Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district.	At least one person per PLC will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs	Who: Science coach & Department chair How: PLC Log	Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Mini-Assessment and Formative data will be used to monitor student progress and identify areas of concern for self remediation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons • District Unit Mini Assessments • FCIM quizzes • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data

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.

The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase

Biology Goal #2:	from 18% to 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18%	21%

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. Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts.	2.1. To strengthen the core curriculum teachers will increase the number of inquiry based instruction and work to increase student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning per unit of instruction. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge.	2.1 Who: Principal APC Science Dept Head Science Teachers. How: Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction.	2.1. Science PLCs will review unit assessments & Mini-Assessments to chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction	2.1. • District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons • District Unit Mini Assessments • FCIM quizzes • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data
	This level student generally has reading fluency but minimal science literacy.	Strategy Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the CIS model (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once for every Unit of the curriculum. Action Steps Professional Development -Teachers in a fuse classroom will attend webinars on fuse strategies. -The district resource reading teacher will model the CIS strategy in the teachers' classrooms.	2.2 .Who Teacher Principal APCs and APs Science Coach District Science Coach Reading Coach Resource Teacher	Science PLC Science Coach and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher meetings PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing it to the baseline data (formative data).	• District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) • Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons • District Unit Mini Assessments • FCIM quizzes • Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes • Semester Exam data

The onsite reading coach will conduct small group trainings for teachers to attend for inservice.

-The Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teacher

-Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on Higher Order Thinking questions and CIS Models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.

In PLCs/Department
-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.

-PLCs review CIS Lesson to determine word count and high-Lexile.

-To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts/assessment questions that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous

- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.

During the lessons, teachers:

-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text in the following ways:

- Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.
- Stating an essential question and/or objective prior to

		<p>reading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using questions to check for understanding. • Using question to engage students in discussion. • Requiring oral and written responses to text. <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p>During the lessons, students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grapple with complex text. • Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. • Engage in discussion to answer essential question and/or address learning objective using textual evidence. • Write in response to essential question using textual evidence 			
3					

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
HOTS	9-12	On the ground coaches	Any science teacher	September 24, 2012	Science Coach will follow up with modeling	Science Coach/ APC/ on the ground math coaches

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 67% to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%	69%

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	-- Adapting to FCAT 2.0's more rigorous scoring standards -- Teachers not understanding how to accurately score writing -- Teachers not devoting enough class time to the teaching of writing -- Teachers not remediating for weaknesses or accurately observing trends in student writing	Strategy -- Teachers will do monthly qualitative and quantitative and timed and untimed progress monitoring of student writing (9th and 10th grades). In addition, they will follow the monthly Writing Instructional Calendar to monitor/remediate students' skills. They will receive training to calibrate scoring through their Writing PLC. -- Furthermore, all English teachers should provide ongoing direct instruction in writing, including instruction in planning, focus and organization, support, and conventions throughout the academic year. This writing instruction is	Who Principal APC Site Writing RT DH District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -- Student writing portfolios as observed during classroom walk-throughs (should show evidence of writing practice and instruction) -- Writing PLC minutes and Writing Action Plan based on SIP goals	1.1 -- Writing PLC members review students' practice scores and discuss trends and how to remediate for weaknesses -- Site Writing RT provides support and models when/where necessary -- District WC provides support and models when/where necessary	1.1 -- Baseline essay -- Monthly timed writings -- Untimed essays (including planning, drafting, and revisions) -- Student portfolios -- Student reflections and self-evaluations

		supported through the Springboard writing workshops	-- Classroom walk-throughs to observe writing lessons -- Evidence of writing instruction in teachers' lessons plans (administrators)		
2	1.2. -- Improving the teaching of Springboard writing workshops across levels. -- Having teachers integrate writing and reading instruction in all levels.	Strategy -- All English teachers should use Springboard writing workshops and other county Best Practices strategies to "marry" writing and reading instruction, placing special emphasis on the "mentor texts" that students read in preparation for writing.	Who -- Principal -- APC -- Site Writing RT -- Instructional Coaches -- Dhs -- PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How Monitored -- During regularly scheduled PLC meetings, including the Writing PLC meeting, teachers should review District BP guidelines for ways in which to incorporate informal writing and reading strategies into weekly lessons. -- Classroom walk-throughs to look for these strategies -- Evidence of writing and reading strategies in teachers' lesson plans (mentor texts) -- Student writing portfolios show evidence of mentor texts, note-taking, and pre-writing activities	1.2. -- PLC monitoring of BP of writing/reading strategies	1.2. -- Timed and untimed essays should show improvement over time through the use of writing/reading strategies

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Generic Writing Training (teaching of writing)	9-10	Writing PLC facilitator (Site Writing RT)	9th- and 10th-grade English teachers	On-going (ER – second and fourth Mondays)	Administration or Coach walk-throughs; PLC logs (minutes) turned into administration	Principal APC PLC Facilitator
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	9-10	Writing PLC facilitator (Site Writing RT)	9th- and 10th-grade English teachers	On-going (October and November) ER – second and fourth Mondays	PLC logs (minutes) turned into administration	Principal APC PLC Facilitator
	9-10	Writing PLC facilitator (Site Writing RT)	9th- and 10th-grade English teachers	On-going (ER – second and fourth Mondays)	Administration or Coach walk-throughs; PLC logs (minutes) turned into administration	Principal APC PLC Facilitator

Writing Budget:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	1. The attendance rate will increase from 92.52% in 2011-2012 to 93.5% in 2012-2013. 2. The attendance rate will increase from 92.52% in 2011-2012 to 93.5% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 7.5%. 3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 9%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
92.52%	93.5%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive

Absences (10 or more)	Absences (10 or more)
401	375
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
182	165

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	1.1 -Attendance committee meets once a week throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks.	Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect
3	Need an Edline Attendance Waiver to increase the number of teachers posting on a weekly basis.	All teachers will post attendance twice during the quarter.	Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ Department Heads will monitor Edline	Principal will use Edline reports to evaluate teachers adherence to policy	Edline Reports
4	There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance	Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
EdLine	9-12	AP	School-wide	September and then as needed basis	Random check of EdLine	AP

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

<p>1. Suspension</p> <p>Suspension Goal # 1:</p>	<p>1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 5%.</p> <p>2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 5%.</p> <p>3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 5%.</p> <p>4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by</p>
--	--

	10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1083	1029
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
499	449
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
331	298
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
227	204

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	There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	-Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.	-Leadership Team -Administration	Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.	UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention				
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:		Data not available as of 10/8/12		
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.				
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:		
NA		NA		
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
NA		NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	See separate Parental Involvement Plan
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.			
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 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	9-12	DHs	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			Sustain the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from ___4_ in 2011-2012 to ___4__in 2012-2013.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events.	CTE Teachers	Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps	Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events

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)

Health and Fitness Goal #1 Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Health and Fitness Goal #1 Goal Health and Fitness Goal #1 Goal #1:		During the 2012- 2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 30% on the Pretest to _40_% on the Posttest.		
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
30%		40%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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 Health and Fitness Goal #1 Goal(s)

Continuous Improvement Goal #1 Goal:

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal #1 Goal Continuous Improvement Goal #1 Goal #1:	The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 21.7% in 2012 to 28% in 2013.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
21.7%	28%

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	There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.	-Department Heads and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.	Principal Leadership Team Department Heads PLC facilitators	-Logs from PLC's will be reviewed.	2012-13 SCIP results

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Continuous Improvement Goal #1 Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Reading Goal 1,2,3 Books to be used in reading classes and english classes	\$400.00
Science Goal 1 Technology to be used in Biology EOC course to help improve EOC scores	\$400.00
Math Goal 1,2,3 EOC Calculators purchased to use in mathematics EOC courses	\$400.00
Reading Goal 1,2,3 Field trip to Barnes and Noble to increase student reading for FCAT	\$500.00

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

Our SAC team will discuss Leto's School Improvement Plan for the upcoming school year. We will distribute SAC funds to teachers and departments that will help us attain the goals set forth in our School Improvement Plan.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Hillsborough School District LETO HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	28%	63%	66%	27%	184	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	40%	72%			112	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?	41% (NO)	66% (YES)			107	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					413	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Hillsborough School District LETO HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	23%	62%	78%	28%	191	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	38%	73%			111	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?	42% (NO)	72% (YES)			114	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					426	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested