FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: OSCEOLA HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Jim DiGiacomo

SAC Chair: Lorena Bruneau

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: October 10,2012

Last Modified on: 9/20/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Jim DiGiacomo	M.Ed-Educational Leadership	1	20	Osceola High School 2010-11 C AYP 2011-12 A AYP
Assis Principal	Bronsky Bryant	M.Ed-Educational Leadership	1		Celebration High School 2010-11 AYP Osceola High School 2011-12 A AYP
Assis Principal	Mark Conners	M.Ed-Educational Leadership	17	7	Osceola High School 2010-11 C AYP 2011-12 A AYP
Assis Principal	Rita Gutierrez Loeding	M.Ed-Educational Leadership		6	Lakeview Elementary 2006-07 A AYP NO 2007-08 A AYP NO 2008-09 A AYP NO Central Ave Elementary 2009-10 D AYP NO 2010-11 B AYP No 2011-12 C AYP NO

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	Christina Remy	BS, Reading Endorsement	4	4	Osceola High School 2011-12 C AYP 2012-13 A AYP
Math/Science	Lynda Crafton				Osceola High School

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	All new teachers attend an in-service, they are provided information about OHS, with an emphasis on policies and procedures. Also included are the electronic grade book (Pinnacle Grade Two) accessing the school's email, and other uses for technology available on campus. A handbook is also provided and reviewed which explains all of the policies and procedures at OHS.	Lynda Crafton & Charlene Lackey	within 30 days of hire	
2	First year teachers meet as a cohort group which assists new teachers in which mini-workshops are given in classroom management, discipline, record keeping, and other pertinent subjects. Daily contact is made by lead teachers, Charlene Lackey and Lynda Crafton. In addition, lead teachers, administrators, department chairperson, National Board Certified Teachers, and other resource personnel visit classroooms regularly. Administrators also complete walk-throughs weekly.	Lynda Crafton & Charlene Lackey	On-going	
3	Administrative staff conducts extensive interviews prior to hiring instructors.	Jim DiGiacomo		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
125	4.8%(6)	18.4%(23)	31.2%(39)	45.6%(57)	32.8%(41)	98.4%(123)	12.0%(15)	2.4%(3)	21.6%(27)

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
Harry Moore	Yannis Guzman	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
William Jakoby	Cheryl Kazmier	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Debra Adams	Scott Birchler	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Debra Adams	Bradley Lennox	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Maria Rodriguez	Javier Maldonado	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Greg Carswell	Jay McBride	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Eva Castiller	Kristin Barran	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Mercedes Sanchez	Jennyfer McDaniel	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
David Holder	George Miller	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Mary Carswell	Melissa Orihill	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Edwin Rios	Alvin Olivo	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Joyce Lambert	Cynthia Sippio	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction
Joyce Lambert	Jessica Dalton	Same department of expertise	Monthly meetings, classroom visits to give feedback and direction

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Christina Remy, RtI and Reading Coach
Mrs. O'Connor, Assistant Principal
Lynda Crafton, Math Coach
Johanna Santiago, Learning Resource Specialist
Tracy Dunlap, Guidance Counselor
Esther Jimenez, ESOL
Rolando Casado, Dean
Judith Lahaye, Speech Therapists
Glenna Spears, ESE

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?

RtI Leadership Teams meets every Monday during second period.
Our feeder middle schools provide information on incoming Freshman when needed.

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

The RtI Leadership Team looks at data of the lowest quartile and ESE/ESOL students. These students have already moved to Tier two when they were placed in Intensive Reading classes therefore RtI assesses whether this placement has been successful. The measurement of success is the increase of the student's DSS scores by 78 points and their ability to be on grade level by graduation. If neither is the case, RtI recommends further interventions (i.e. 21st Century, AIP's).

MTSS Implementation

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

> The data source(s) and the data management system(s) are PMRN (FAIR), FCAT, Formative Assessments, Empower 3000, Read180 and Data Director.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> The RtI team will watch Florida Department of Education Understanding RtI videos.
> They will also attend all county Professional Developments on RtI.
>
> The RtI coach will inform OHS faculty and staff on RtI procedures during Pre-planning.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> Jim DiGiacomo , Principal
> Mark Conners, Assistant Principal
> Christina Remy, Reading Coach
> Lynda Crafton, Math Coach
> Johanna Santiago, Learning Resource Specialist
> Paul Torrey, Reading Teacher
> Pam Wood, Electives Department Head
> Tracy Dunlap, Guidance Counselor
> Esther Jimenez, ESOL

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

> LLT will meet once a month after school. The primary function of the LLT is to determine school wide Reading needs and how we can best meet those needs. LLT will start the year with a Reading survey aimed at the students, parents and teachers to determine Reading attitude and desires.

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

> School wide Sustained Silent Reading, a Reading Celebration, Battle of the Books and mentoring program.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

>

*Grades 6-12 Only

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

*High Schools Only

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

Each student must declare a major of interest at enrollment. Declaring a major provides students with the opportunity to explore that major in depth and participate in hands on experiences.

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

The career specialist assists students with a their 4 year high school plan to pursue post secondary education. One of the main components of this preparation involves Prep HQ which assists students with sequencing of course selections.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Improving student readiness to post secondary education will be accomplished by ensuring students participation in ACT/SAT prep. In addition, OHS invites college recruiters to visit our campus to speak with students on college life and the opportunities available to them. OHS also holds college fairs where students take the opportunity to gain additional knowledge of college life and the entrance requirements for enrollment. The career specialist remains actively involved and available for student assistance during their 4 years at OHS. She provides individual assistance regarding financial aid, scholarships, and college application assistance.

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:	Each grade level will increase the amount of students achieving 3 or better by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9th grade 19% of 593 Students 10th grade 19% of 511 Students	9th grade 24% of students will achieve Level 3 in reading 10th grade 24% of students will achieve Level 3 in reading

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Guided and Independent practice of Reading skills	School Wide SSR School Wide use of Reading Legend Implementation of Socratic Seminar and Philosophical Chairs.	Reading Coach Administration	Progress Monitoring	FAIR Formative Assessments FCAT
2	Students who achieved a level three on FCAT Reading are not in an Intensive Reading class.	Teachers will follow the Reading Calendar. Professional Development will be offered to help teachers with Reading strategies. Students will have tutoring options through 21st Century.	Reading Coach Administration	Walk throughs Progress Monitoring	Assessments Tutoring Attendance

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Level 5 students will maintain their Reading Levels 5% of Level 4 students will increase their scores to Level 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9th grade Level 4 10% and Level 5 3% 10th grade Level 4 13% and Level 5 3%	9th grade - 15% of Level 5 10th grade - 18% of Level 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Guided and Independent practice of Reading skills	School Wide SSR School Wide use of Reading Legend Implementation of Socratic Seminar and Philosophical Chairs.	Reading Coach Administration	Progress Monitoring	FAIR Formative Assessments FCAT
2	Students performing at Level 4 and 5 do not have a Reading class.	School Wide SSR. Teachers will be offered training during the school year on how to implement Reading strategies in their classroom. School Wide Reading Calendar will be followed.	Reading Coach Administration	Progress Monitoring Observations	Assessments Daily Spurs

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

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

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

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

	3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	Increase the number of students making learning progress by 5%.
	Reading Goal #3a:	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	49 % of students made learning gains in Reading	More than 54% of students will make learning gains in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Supporting the struggling readers with appropriate interventions	provide teacher inservices concentrated on areas of that need improvement regarding student performance	Administrative Team Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring Administrative Walk-throughs IPDPs	IPDPs FAIR reports Formative Assessment Reports FCAT
2	Maintaining or increasing Reading practice for Levels 3 or above.	School wide SSR	Administrative Team	Formative Assessment Reports	Administrative Walk-throughs
3	CBT is now in effect.	Hold E-Pat and computer sessions to help students prepare to use the computer for testing.	Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring	FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	Increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 5%.
Reading Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | 54% of students made learning gains in Reading | 59% of students will make learning gains in Reading |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are significantly behind grade level in Reading	Students will be placed in Intensive Reading Classes	Administrative Team Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring	FAIR Formative Assessments FCAT Grades
2	Students need individual targeted attention.	Teachers will use data driven instruction in their classrooms to target trouble areas. Students will be enrolled in 21st Century for support in Reading.	Administrative Team Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring	Empower 3000 Read180 Skills Tutor

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 :					
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:	Increase the number of students in each subgroup making satisfactory progress in Reading by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
American Indian 60% Asian 59% Black 43% Hispanic 48% Multi-Racial 44% White 53%	American Indian 65% Asian 64% Black 48% Hispanic 53% Multi-Racial 49% White 58%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in sub groups are significantly behind in Reading	Teachers will create small group instruction lessons to target areas that need improvement.	Reading Coach Administration	Progress Monitoring	Read180 Empower 3000 FAIR Formative Assessments
2	Students are not achieving grade level standards.	Students will be encouraged to join 21st Century for extra tutoring in Reading.	Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring	Study Island

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:	Decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	57% of ELL student WILL make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are in the process of learning English as well as trying to improve their Reading ability	Intensive Reading classes Increasing vocabulary exposure	Administration	Progress Monitoring Formal Assessments	FAIR FCAT CELLA Formative Assessments
2	Students are not literate in their native language which makes it difficult to become literate in English.	Students will be encouraged to join 21st Century to receive tutoring in English and Reading.	Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring	Reading Plus Empower3000 Study Island

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Decrease the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 5%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress.	47% of SWD students WILL make satisfactory progress in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Special diploma students will be in regular Reading classes which will be a new challenge to students.	Teachers will follow students IEP and behavior plans	Administration	Progress Monitoring Assessments	FCAT FAIR Formative Assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Decrease the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 5%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	53% of economically disadvantaged students WILL make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack background knowledge of subject areas	Teachers will build background knowledge through Empower 3000 or Read180 to introduce new topics.	Reading Coach Administration	Progress Monitoring	Formative Assessments Grades

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
CIS (ComprehensionInstructional Sequence) Lessons	All Core Subjects 9-12	Reading Coach	All Core Subjects	Once a month	Walk-throughs Follow-up PD	Reading Coach Administration
Introduction to Common Core Instruction	Reading 9-12	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers	Once a quarter	Walk-throughs Follow-up PD	Reading Coach Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental Resources	Reading Skills Reading Strategies	Title Funds SAC Funds	$10,000.00
			Subtotal: $10,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Software	Research base	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Guest Speakers	Speakers on CCSS and CIS	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Common Core	Conference	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $6,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	**$19,000.00**

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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 level 3 is the small middle group, which has a tendency to be overlooked… Our focus will be on properly placing these student in the next math course and making sure they are in small class groups.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The level 3 for the spring was 29%(108)of 374 students taking the test.	With the experience of taking the test and providing material related to the test our expectation is to increase the percent to 30% to 35% of 600 students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students access to computers. Students background of subject lacking.	Place 5 or more computers in each classroom. To intensive the review of the necessary background material.	Math Coach Math Department Head Teacher	County made spiral reviews Chapter tests Bell Work	County made spiral testing. Graded material observation

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Students at this level are some of our top students. This group needs to be encouraged to take higher level math classes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The spring test identified 3%(12) in level 4 achievement.	We expect this level to increase by 5% or 6%(20-30).

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Lack of testing on a computer. Lack of background knowledge.	Setting up rotations with para-professionals as a pull out on the computer and individualize the study.	math coach math department para-professional teachers	mini-assessments observation goal setting progress	chapter tests mini-assessements bell work

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # Our achievement gap is 81%(100) white to 52%(76) black, which is around 19% difference.. 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	The total proficiency is 62%(536)of the students. This is a substantial amount of students.. We have designed mini stations to be used in the classroom along with computers in the classroom.. This should help to individualize those that may have difficulty learning in large groups, which will cut down some the barriers.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The total proficiency is 62%(536)of the students. 81%(100) of white are proficient, 53%(76) of black are proficient and 56%(240) of hispanic are proficient..	With the practice sets designed for the test and computers in the room we would expect an increase to 65% proficient for next year.

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 background vocabulary	Tailor the material for background and language. Individualize with mini stations to help with small groups. Material designed to help with racial and language barriers.	Math coach Math department chair ESOL teachers Math teachers	Monitoring student progress with review exercises Observations	Chapter tests Bell Work County design tests Observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	Language barrier is the significant area of improvement for this subgroup. RtI group will monitor this area and provide necessary help along with the ELL team.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(135) students are proficient in algebra.	With the extra monitoring and designed mini lessons the proficiency should increase by 5% for the first year.

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	Vocabulary is the significant area for improvement	mini lesson directed to subgroup RtI monitoring ELL teachers sharing strategies with others	math coach ELL teachers RtI team	Monitoring ELL testing Teacher observations	Chapter Tests County Tests Observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	A significant number of students did not make satisfactory on the Algebra EOC... Computer testing was difficult for some of these students. The testing environment had an impact on their results..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%(13) students met satisfactory progress in Algebra.. 119 students at Osceola High School fit in this category.	New mini lessons and increased computer usage will hopefully increase progress by 5%(18).

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	Difficult in the use of computers. Background in algebra weak.	Installing 5 computers in every room for usage. Mini lessons based on algebra standards	math coach RtI team Math teachers	Observation Monitoring computer material mini lessons monitored	Chapter tests County tests observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	Identify economically disadvantage students in high school is a challenge. Proper nourishment before the test is part of sucess on the test. We offer free breakfast and lunch.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(177) of our disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in Algebra.	Experiencing the test for several years on the computer will increase the performance by at least 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Identifying those students. Proper nourishment during test and also dring the school day. Students lacking background knowledge.	Offering everyone at the school free breakfast. Mini lessons designed to help with algebra standards. RtI monitoring those students not making progress.	math coach RtI team math teachers	observation computer usage increasing review strategies	chapter tests bell work county tests

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	Geometry is a new computer test. Modification of curriculum and computer practice is our challenge.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Osceola High School had 14%(75) students in the top 3rd of the new test.	Better preparation should increase the percent in this level by 5%(60).

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	Computer practice Deciding on what is essential material and which is not.	Place computers in each classroom. Teams designed to study standards and making decisions on essential material.	math coach RtI team math teachers county coaches	observation bell work mini lessons modeled	observation tests bell work grades

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 challenge of a new test is to familiarizing students with the vocabulary and using the computer. Our challenge is usage of computers and new material and to motivate the level 4 students to stay level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14%(75) students are performing at this level.,	Increase by 5%(60) or more.

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	New test on computer Prioritize the essential material.	Install 5 computers in every classroom. Appoint a team to look at material and find the essential material.	math coach math teachers county math coaches	observation bell work passing rate on test	chapter tests county tests

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # Our achievement gap is 81%(100) white to 52%(76) black, which is around 19% difference.. 3A :

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	The total proficincy is 62%(536) of the students. This is a large amount of students. We have designed mini-assignments geared to use a computer, to individualize, as well as, working alone time. Our goal is to challenge the students to work independently on material and the computer.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
The proficiency is 62%(536) of the students.. 81% (100) of white are proficient, 53% of the black are proficient and 56% (24)) of the hispanic.	With additional practice, pull-outs, and better designing the material, we expect an increase to 65% proficiency for next year.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1				Monitoring student progress with review exercises Observations	
2	Lack of background knowledge. Vocabulary Computer Usage	Tailor the material for background and language. Individualize mini stations to help with small groups Material desinged to help with racial and language barriers.	math coach math department chair ESOL teacher RtI	monitoring students progress with review exercises Observations	chapter tests bell work county design tests observations

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	Language barrier is the significant area of improvement for this subgroup. RtI team will monitor this are and provide necessary help along with the ELL team.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
56%(135) students are proficient in Geometry	with the extra monitoring and pull-outs the proficiency should increase by 5%(60) for the first year.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary	mini-lessons ELL teachers sharing strategies	ELL teacher math coach RtI	monitoring ELL testing Teacher observation	chapter test county test observations

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making

satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	Computer testing is the challenge for this subgroup. The testing environment, mini lessons, and pull-out will help this group.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
13%(13) students satisfactorial progress in Geometry	New mini-lessons and increase computer usage will increase the progress by 5%(18).			

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	Computer Vocabulary background knowledge	Increase the computer usage. Design mini-lesson with increase in vocabulary and background knowledge.	math department math coach ESE teachers	observation monitoring and increase use of computers mini-lessons pull-outs	observation mini-assessments bell work chapter tests

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	Nourishment and lack of concentration is significant in this group. Background knowledge and vocabulary are also challenges.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(177) made satisfactory progress in geometry.	Experiencing the test on the computer will increase the performance by 5%(15).

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	Proper nourishment to help with concentration. Vocabulary and background knowledge.	Offering free breakfast for everyone. Mini-lessons and increase in computer usage.	math coach math department head RtI	observation mini assessments	chapter tests bell work observation

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core EOC Smart Board Data Analysis	9-12 Algebra Geometry	math coach	math teachers	all year	presentation by teachers	math coach administrator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Smart board math supplement Computer software	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCTM conference Common Core Workshops	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $10,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring

at or above Level 7 in science.

Science Goal #2:

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

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	Comprehension of the type of questions on the test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 students took a field test, so data is not available.	5%( )increase in comprehension of a formal test format.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low 10th grade reading scores indicate potential difficulties in reading the items on the biology test.	Sustained silent reading in the science content area on Wednesday in every class every week	Science Dept. Chair	Teacher-made assessments of reading assignment	EOC Biology practice tests or other teacher made tests
2	Students who need review of topics covered in previous science courses	A series of activities designed to review major concepts and teach test-taking strategies. To be conducted as a series of "pull-out" sessions during the school day during the second semester	Science Dept. Chair	Comparison of pre- and post-test scores of students in teacher made assessments.	Pre- and Post-tests
3	Inability to read, analyze, and interpret information presented in graphic form	Daily Spur bellwork activities and lab activities that teach graphing skills	Science Dept. Chair	Teacher-made assessments of graphing skills	Lab reports; Pre- and post-tests
	Lack of knowledge of	Teachers in the	Science Dept.	Observation of student	Lab reports; Pre-

4	the process of science and the inability to apply the scientific method to the solution of experimental problems.	Science Dept. will be conducting a minimum of two laboratory exercises per week, including inquiry labs, to teach the scientific method	Chair	participation in laboratory activities and lab reports	and post-tests
5	Lack of knowledge of the metric system and the inability to make measurements using the metric system and the inability to use metric units in the solution of problems.	Lab activities that involve metric measurement and which use metric units to solve experimental problems	Science Dept. Chair	Observation of student participation in laboratory activities and lab reports	Lab reports; Pre- and post-tests

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	Students having difficulties in reading the test vocabulary and performance on computers. The endurance on taking the test on the computer.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The biology EOC was a field test.	All students tested in level 4 will be 5% or more.

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	Difficulty in reading and understanding the questions and vocabulary used on standardized science tests.	Sustained Silent Reading in the science content area every Wednesday with emphasis on increasing knowledge of science vocabulary.	Science Dept. Chair	Mini assessments	Teacher-made question sheets or other assessment tools.

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
Vocabulary Endurance Comprehension	9-12 Science	Science Department chair Math/Science Coach	Science Department	Monthly	Observation Bellwork chapter tests	science department chair math/science coach

Science Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplementary Material	Research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$1,000.00
		Subtotal: $1,000.00	

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Calculators Interactive Labs	Calculators Gizmos	Title Funds SAC Funds	$6,000.00
		Subtotal: $6,000.00	

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Inservices Speakers Conferences	Research Based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$4,000.00
		Subtotal: $4,000.00	

Other

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

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT Writes scores, total proficiency decreased from 94% to 82%.To return to previous success in writing, the 2013 scores will reflect a 6% increase. In order to achieve this increase, PDA strategies to improve support and organization in writing (as demonstrated in the PDA HS manual) will continue to be incorporated into the curriculum.In addition, a strong emphasis on mechanics in writing (especially timed writing drafts) will occur in all English classes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (441 these are the students of 2012)	88%(522 these are the students of 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	Students not having adequate practice and instruction in timed writing tests, including attention to avoiding grammatical errors in a timed writing situation.	County based writing assessments / tracking student scores.	Carswell-department chair	Writing data collected throughout the school year.	FCAT Writes Scores

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	Based on 2012 FCAT Writes scores, total proficiency decreased from 78% to 65%. To return to previous success in writing, the 2013 scores will reflect a 5%

at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:		increase. In order to achieve this increase, PDA strategies to improve support and organization in writing (as demonstrated in the PDA HS manual) will continue to be incorporated into the curriculum.In addition, a strong emphasis on mechanics in writing (especially timed writing drafts) will occur in all English classes.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
65%(349 these are the students of 2012)		70% (415 these are the students of 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	Students not having adequate practice and instruction in timed writing tests, including attention to avoiding grammatical errors in a timed writing situation.	County based writing assessments / tracking student scores.	Carswell-department chair	Writing data collected throughout the year.	FCAT Writes scores

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
Writing scores from county assessments.	10	Department Chair	English 2-teachers	Monthly department meetings Every Wednesday the writing teachers are meeting.	Implementation of PDA strategies, concentrating in mechanics of writing.	Department Chair

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
Supplementary Materials	Research Based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
Software	Vocabulary Conventions	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Software	Vocabulary Conventions	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $6,000.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
Professional Development inservices Conferences Speakers	Research base	Title Funds SAC funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $14,000.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
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:	Continue to implement strategies and incentives to increase student attendance.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96% (1859 students)	Above 95% (1944 students)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
185/year	Below 150/year
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Aproximately 120 tardies to school/week.	Maintain/decrease tardies to school.

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	Poverty/homelessness and lack of parent involvement. Lack of interest in school.	Incentive program. Early Intervention Meetings are held once a week to address truancy.	AP. Mrs. Frances O'Connor	Monitor student improvement through TERMS and teacher feedback.	S250 Attendance report & Pinnacle failure report is generated once /month.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Implement strategies & incentives to decrease the number of out of school suspensions for 2011-2012.
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1294	Decrease by 20%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
835	Decrease by 10%.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1379	Decrease by 20%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
625	Decrease by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students who violate the safety of other students are the strongest barrier to decreasing the number of students suspended.	Ensure RTI strategies are implemented. Establish early communication with parents. Increase peer	AP Clarence Brown	Deans will monitor students. Teacher feedback.	Data from TERMS.

| 1 | | mediation. Require suspended students to attend meetings with parents facilitated by PBS resource specialist to reduce the number of suspension days. Continual reinforcement of positive behavior, extracurricular activities and academic achievement. | | | |

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: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Continue to implement strategies & interventions to support students who are at risk of dropping out.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
.009%	< 1%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
95%	> 95%

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	Loss of interest & lack of motivation. Poor academic achievement. Peer conflict.	Monitor at risk students. When neeeded provide alternative options to complete education.	AP Frances O'Connor	Monitor students using TERMS and pinnacle data. Teacher feedback.	Data reports from TERMS and Pinnacle.

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Improve communicaton systems to increase the rate of participation of parents in school activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Approximately 1,800 parents/family members participated in school events throughout the 2010-2011 school year.	Increase 2011-2012 participation by 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Difficulty providing timely information on school activities for parents.	Promote regular maintenance of school web site, particularly through the summer months. Create questions on the school climate survey to monitor parent satisfaction with information on the web site and level of communication from the school.	SAC and school administration	Regular SAC monthly action item to monitor the quality of the information about SAC and opportunities for parent involvement on the web site. Analysis of school climate survey results.	School activity sign-in sheets and the responses to the questions on the school climate survey
2	Difficulty providing accurate infomation about SAC and other opportunities for parental involvement in print documents.	SAC input into quarterly newsletter content. Produce and distribute print materials about SAC and other parental involvement activities.	SAC	Quarterly SAC action item to monitor involvement in newsletter content and development and distribution of print materials. Analysis of school	School activity sign-in sheets and the responses to the questions on the school climate survey.

				climate survey 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						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE	

CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Supplemental Resources	Reading Skills Reading Strategies	Title Funds SAC Funds	$10,000.00
Mathematics	Common Core	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$5,000.00
Science	Supplementary Material	Research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$1,000.00
Writing				$0.00
Writing	Supplementary Materials	Research Based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $21,000.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Software	Research base	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Mathematics	Smart board math supplement Computer software	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$2,000.00
Science	Calculators Interactive Labs	Calculators Gizmos	Title Funds SAC Funds	$6,000.00
Writing				$0.00
Writing	Software	Vocabulary Conventions	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Writing	Software	Vocabulary Conventions	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $17,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Guest Speakers	Speakers on CCSS and CIS	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Reading	Common Core	Conference	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Mathematics	FCTM conference Common Core Workshops	research based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$3,000.00
Science	Inservices Speakers Conferences	Research Based	Title Funds SAC Funds	$4,000.00
Writing				$0.00
Writing	Professional Development inservices Conferences Speakers	Research base	Title Funds SAC funds	$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $16,000.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing				$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $54,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

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
PBS-Positive Behavior Support	$200.00
Curriculum/Resources	$200.00
Media Center Resources	$200.00

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

The OHS School Advisory council will meet every month on the first Monday of the month. The council will work in conjunction with school administration and staff to review and update the School Improvement Plan and prepare school budget. We will continue to actively recruit new parents to be involved in SAC. Guest speakers will be invited to share important information about academics, school activities, and community involvement/events. We will monitor, assess, and provide feedback on communication techniques including the Website and quarterly newsletter. The council will assist in the distribution and review of school climate surveys.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Osceola School District OSCEOLA HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	36%	67%	83%	28%	214	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	52%	76%			128	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?	55% (YES)	71% (YES)			126	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					468	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Osceola School District OSCEOLA HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	33%	67%	84%	31%	215	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	49%	78%			127	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?	45% (NO)	71% (YES)			116	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					468	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested