FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PIPER HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Enid Valdez

SAC Chair: Jovan Conde

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/04/2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67%

	Principal	Enid Valdez	MA English ED.S Educational Leadership	7	12	Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Assis Principal	Robert E.Goodwin	MA Educational Leadership	5	5	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in

						Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Assis Principal	Patrick Lowe	MA Educational Leadership	5	5	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
						Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in

	Assis Principal	William Meadows	MA Educational Leadership	8	17	EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Assis Principal	Christie Cerbone	MA Educational Leadership	1	1	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42%

					% of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (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)
English Department Chair	Richard Wells	English 6-12 ESE K-12	9	5	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C

					FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
Reading Coach / Department Chair	Miriam Udell	Reading Certification K-12 ESOL endorsed Elementary Ed. K-6	2	2	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
					Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a

	Math Coach / Department Chair	Jacalyn Stein	Mathematics 6-12 Business Education 6-12	27	5	FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Science Coach / Department Chair	Robert Pearson	Chemistry and Biology 6-12	5	1	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains

						(Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Math Department Chair	Patricia Maynard	Mathematics 6-12	31	5	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
						Piper High School

	Social Studies Department Chair	Donovan Collins	Social Sciences 6-12	21	4	2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
						Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012

	Science Coach / Department Chair	Lorin Kawesch	Chemistry and Biology 6-12	14	1	School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
	Social Studies Department Chair	Vanessa Pinzon	Social Sciences 6-12	6	2	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26%

					% of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO
Career / Technical Education Department Chair	JoEllen Moneck		31	13	Piper High School 2012-2013 School Grade = Pending FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in Reading 2.0 = 42% Level 3 or above (High Standards) in EOC Algebra = 65% FCAT Level 4 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 85% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Biology = n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC Geometry= n/a FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards)in EOC History = n/a % of Students making Learning Gains (FCAT Reading 2.0)= 57% % of Students making Learning Gains (EOC Algebra) = 78% Lowest 25% (Reading) = 62% Lowest 25% (EOC Algebra)= 62% College Readiness (Reading)= 57% College Readiness (Math)= 67% Acceleration(Participation)= 84% Acceleration(Performance)= 93% Graduation Rate (At Risk) = n/a Graduation Rate (Overall) = n/a 2011-2012 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 36% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 67% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 82% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 62% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO 2010-2011 School Grade = C FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Reading = 32% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Math = 69% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Writing = 91% FCAT Level 3 or above (High Standards) in Science = 26% % of Students making Learning Gains (Reading) = 42% % of Students making Learning Gains (Math) = 75% AYP of Lowest 25% (Reading) = 44% AYP of Lowest 25% (Math) = 67% Did Piper make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) = NO

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	Highly qualified/certified teachers are placed as per district surplus guidelines.	Enid Valdez, Principal and all Assistant Principals	August 2012	
2	New teachers and teachers in need of support are aligned with istructional coaches and support staff.	Enid Valdez, Principal and all Assistant Principals	June 2013	
		Enid Valdez,		

3	Teachers are recognized for their competencies to boost teacher morale and motivation.	Principal and all Assistant Principals	June 2013	

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
7 out of 120 instructional staff = 6%	Administration will meet with each teacher to review the documentation procedures, student/parent letter distribution procedures, and workshop/course completion dates. Teachers will attend/complete required workshops/courses during the 2012-2013 school year.

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
120	5.8%(7)	13.3%(16)	45.0%(54)	41.7%(50)	37.5%(45)	94.2%(113)	10.8%(13)	7.5%(9)	45.8%(55)

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
Richard Wells	Gibson Sylvestry	Both teachers will be certified in English. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject content area to assist the mentee based on observed needs for improvement in these areas. Teachers will also share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.

		development will be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data.	
Daniel Spencer	Peter Mahmood	Both teachers will be certified in ROTC. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellentclassroommanagement skills and competence within subject content area. Teachers will also share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional development is geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.
Robert Pearson	Brandon Vargas	Both teachers will be certified in Science. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject content area. Teachers will share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional development will also be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.
Tracey Fuller	Louin Remy	Both teachers will be certified in Fine Arts. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject content area. Teachers will share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor

		development will also be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.
JoEllen Moneck	Felix Morales	Both teachers will be certified in Culinary Arts. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject content area. Teachers will also share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional development will be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.
Celia Hausknecht	Megan D'Orvilliers	Both teachers will be certified in English. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject content area. Teachers will share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional development will also be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.
		Both teachers will be certified in CTE / HOSA. Instructional coach/mentor will posses excellent classroom management skills and competence within subject	Initial orientation and pairing of mentor/mentee based on subject area

LisaSue Sherman	Fernando Vargas	content area. Teachers will share common planning and curriculum focus. Professional development will also be geared toward teacher training and students needs based on data and to support mentee who is new to the school.	content takes place during pre-planning week. Weekly meetings are conducted during the months of August and September. Monthly meetings will begin on October 1st. The mentor and mentee will meet collaboratively on a weekly basis.

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 II - Reading Coach (TBA)

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Students in the 30% percentile and below in both reading and math are targeted through RTI Level 3 interventions - using pull out and individual tutoring as well as collaborative review of data, student grades and student data chats at interims.

Students attend labs setting for FCAT Explorer, Reading Plus, EOC tutorials, Science software and BEEP supplementary curriculum.

Students in this category also receive pullout and individual remedial services depending on the student's learning needs and abilities through guidance, teacher, administrative monitoring.

Violence Prevention Programs

Piper was recognized as a Prevention Schools of Excellence since the inception of the district program. By using several supplemental programs that promote anti-violence, students are encouraged to maintain order. There is also an anti-bullying counselor that works with conflict resolution techniques and administration is visible on campus and in constant communication with at-risk students to ensure safety. Assemblies are also held to discuss expectations of excellence in all grade levels.

Nutrition Programs

We have instituted a Wellness Center specifically geared towards the inclusion of ESE students and our Physical Education Department.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

All Piper students have the opportunity to register for courses offered through the Piper Community School program on campus. Piper also works closely with its community school to facilitate any GED / ESOL services and/or credit recovery course needed.

Career and Technical Education

Based on the final approved CTE 5-year strategic plan, Piper High School's Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs prepare students to earn a high school diploma, industry certification in a career area, and to provide the opportunity to choose from a variety of post-secondary options and/or vocational careers. Piper High School has the following CTE programs: Technology Studies, Health Occupation Services, Culinary Arts, Fashion Design Services, Customer Service, Automotive Services, Graphic Design, and Web Design. In addition, Piper is continuing to encourage teachers to attend CARPD and Reading Endorsement professional development. Piper teachers are currently attending courses to meet certification requirements for CAPE Academies.

To help students identify their interests, Piper is using FACTS.org for career and education planning research activities and host a yearly CTE fair to articulate the school's program to all students. We also accommodate ESE students in these areas to encourage life/career skills.

Job Training

We offer OJT work experience to students in grades 11 and 12. Students can choose from a variety of careers in which they display interest and are able to seek jobs in these areas in order to gain experience. They also review resume strategies and procedures for finding a job. We also have an ESE Job Coach available on campus.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI Case managers are Jodi Weinstein,, Derrick Burgess, Grace Taylor (Guidance Counselors), Phyllis Babrove (Social Worker), Eminette Pardo (School Psychologist), Linda Tarlton (Guidance Director), Jaime Morales (ESE Specialist), Miriam Udell (Reading Dept. Coach), Sarah Cabrera, Robert Pearson (Science Dept. Co-Chairs), Jacalyn Stein, Trish Maynard (Math Dept. Co-Chairs), Richard Wells (English Dept.Chair) Patrick Lowe, Bobby Goodwin, Lizette Hevia, William Meadows,(Assistant Principals) and Enid Valdez, (Principal). This team also meets to coordinate the RtI meetings.

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?

Our RtI team functions by meeting weekly and may meet as often as necessary to address student needs. Each grade level administrator coordinates the RtI meetings. There is one teacher representative from each content area, as well as the academic coach and/or counselor/case manager depending on the student need. Principal and administration meets with Department Chairs weekly. Part of the meeting is set aside to address at-risk students and RtI intervention levels. The Reading Coach, Title I Reading, Math, and Science coaches meet on a weekly basis with the Principal and Administrative Team. The team also meets to discuss lesson plans, modeling strategies, specific student issues, identification and monitoring of AYP student subgroups, and the review of assessment structures and results for revision, remediation, and enrichment. The Principal guides each group to review the progress of programs on student achievement. The Principal does this through the analysis of district mini-assessments as well as FAIR and in-house assessments. The teams then create a calendar to coordinate and address areas of need in classrooms. The RtI Leadership Team is tracking and recording/storing data in FileMaker-Pro. Meetings are held before/after school and on designated dates.

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 role of the RtI Leadership Team (Collaborative Problem-Solving Team) is to review comprehensive student data to identify the target group and develop an instructional and behavioral plan that will address student learning needs. Our administrative team, department chairs, instructional coaches and teacher mentors form part of the RtI committee (CPST) and are tracking/ recording/storing and analyzing data for targeted students. Through the use of a behavior learning check list, and intervention strategies matrix, each mentor teacher will work with students and their teachers to determine student needs and a plan of action for the interventions that will take place. The RtI team (CPST) is currently observing effective implementation of content standards through classroom walk throughs, teacher observations, and instructional coaches recommendations. The team also uses the state and district supported assessment tool to assess student progress and to monitor effectiveness of instruction and compliance with the school improvement plan. The RtI Leadership Team (CPST) analyzes Tier I data to determine if our current school-wide core curriculum and approach to behavior management need modification through many learning communities such as: departmental common planning sessions, Professional Study Day sessions, monthly department chair meetings, RtI Leadership Team (CPST) meetings, and administrative meetings. During these learning communities the team members will also identify students who could be at risk of not meeting target goals. The RtI (CPST) team conducts CWTs bi-weekly to observe the effective implementation of content standards. These processes contribute to the development and implementing of SIP through the learning strategies the instructional team identified as needed to improve student learning after reviewing data.

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.

In the subject areas of writing, the sources used for Tier 1 data are: monthly writing prompts and BAT data. For Tier 2 the sources are bi-weekly writing prompts and teacher feedback of remediation lessons and intervention records and progress monitoring graphs. Also, pull-outs/push-ins are used as an intensive instructional strategy to address those students that are struggling with their writing skills. For Tier 3, the sources used are weekly assessments on the 6 traits of writing, teacher feedback of remediation lessons, and student writing samples submitted monthly to the administrative team for review.

In reading the sources used for Tier 1 data are: FAIR and mini bats. For Tier 2, the sources are bi-weekly mini assessments and teacher-student data chats, and intervention records and progress monitoring graphs shared with the teachers by the reading coach during common planning. Also, pull-outs/push-ins are used as an intensive instructional strategy to address those students that are struggling with their reading skills. For Tier 3, the sources are weekly assessments of specific skills, and teacher feedback of remediation lessons, co-teaching models with the coach and pull out lessons. PMRN logs, status reports to the Principal and progress monitoring graphs are data management.

In math, the sources used for Tier 1 data are: a pre-diagnostic test, FCAT, BAT data. For Tier 2, the sources include bi-weekly school-wide EOC assessments, district mandated BAT assessments (bi-yearly), the evaluation of intervention records, and review of progress monitoring graphs. Also, pull-outs/ push-ins are used as an intensive instructional strategy to address those students that are struggling with their math skills. For Tier 3, the sources are bi-weekly mini-assessments of specific skills, and teacher feedback of remediation lessons and intervention records and progress monitoring graphs.

In science, the sources used for Tier 1 data are: a pre-diagnostic test, BAT, and FCAT data. Tier 2, the sources include weekly school-wide EOC assessments, the evaluation of intervention records, and review of progress monitoring graphs. Also, pull-outs/ push-ins are used as an intensive instructional strategy to address those students that are struggling with their science skills. For Tier 3, the sources are bi-weekly mini-assessment of specific strands, teacher feedback of remediation lessons, and intervention records and progress monitoring graphs.

A comprehensive data binder and database which outlines all data for our student population is also used as a source for all subject areas and for Tiers 1, 2 and 3.

Behavior is monitored through direct reports to the administrative team on internal suspension, referrals, and attendance reports. This data serves as the precursor to Tier 3 along with an intensive review of the student's academic history. This data is kept on Filemaker Pro and updated as interventions are implemented.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Administration, instructional coaches, and department heads will continue with RtI training during pre-planning days in August 2011, through department meetings, professional learning communities, and school-wide professional development. The instructional staff has been trained on the various tiers of RtI, the use of universal assessments, student interventions, strategies, data collection sources and methods, and graphing of data. Professional articles, research based materials, descriptions, have been posted on email to all faculty to continue familiarizing staff with the process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Enid Valdez (Principal), Christie Cerbone (Assistant Principal), Patrick Lowe (Assistant Principal), Bobby Goodwin (Assistant Principal), William Meadows (Assistant Principal), Miriam Udell (Reading Coach), Richard Wells (English Department Chair), Angel Miranda (ESOL Coordinator), Jaime Morales (ESE Specialist), Jaclyn Stein (Math Coach and Department Chair), Robert Pearson (Science Department Chair),Lorin Kawesch (Science Co-Chair), Patricia Maynard (Math Department Chair), Jo Lantowski (Media Specialist), Donovan Collins (Social Studies Department Chair), Vanessa Pinzon (Social Studies Co-Chair), Linda Tarlton (Guidance Director), Grace Taylor (Guidance Counselor), Derrick Burgess (Guidance Counselor), Jodie Weinstein (Guidance Counselor). Each of these members were selected because of their vital role in our school. They are guidance counselors, instructional coaches, department chairs, content area teachers, or part of the administrative staff. Each of these members also represents the various grade levels and content areas within the school. The members of this literacy team are knowledgeable in integrating literacy strategies into the content areas. Also, as aligned with the Broward K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, the team members demonstrate a long-term professional commitment to increased students achievement in reading through improving classroom instruction and practices.

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

The LLT meets monthly. In the monthly sessions, EOC,FCAT, FAIR, BAT, RtI, and mini-assessment data is disaggregated and a plan of action is generated based on the outcomes of the data. Plans for professional development and professional learning communities are then decided through a collaborative planning meeting. Team leaders, academic coaches, and administrators supervise the LLT. The major goals of the LLT are to: analyze data and plan accordingly; plan and implement professional development activities that support literacy integration into all content areas; infuse literacy strategies into the curriculum of each content area, train teachers accordingly, and monitor the progress; support teachers in the planning of and implementation of literacy strategies into their curriculum; and develop a plan to increase student motivation in literacy. The team collaboratively works together by meeting monthly to analyze data (such as mini assessments, BAT, FAIR FCAT, EOC, etc.) and addresses the LLT goals and school-wide implementation progress. The LLT may also conduct CWTs to monitor literacy/strategy incorporation. When the LLT meets, after analyzing data, they look for patterns and gaps. The LLT shares strategies, gives feedback, and develops plans for supporting teachers (ie. Modeling, co-teaching models, mentoring, etc.) and increasing student motivation (ie. incentive plans). During the collaboration meeting, the LLT monitors and evaluates the progress of the LLT interventions and action plan, then modifies the plan as needed and seeks support if/when necessary. Team information is shared with the entire staff at departmental common planning and at Profesional Developement sessions held on Professional Study Days.

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

As aligned with the Broward K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, the primary purpose of the LLT is to create capacity of reading knowledge and reading strategy implementation within the entire school community while focusing on areas of literacy concern across the school. The LLT will concentrate on the implementation of activities/tasks/initiatives to meet the reading related goals and objectives established in the School Improvement Plan. The LLT will assist in the implementation of the school's professional development plan, as well as professional learning communities and lesson study groups. With the support and guidance of the Principal, the LLT will work towards building a culture of reading throughout the school through reading initiatives that demonstrate a commitment to student achievement through teaching and learning strategies. The LLT will use data (as indicated above) to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesign instruction and resources to meet the students' instructional, motivational, and intervention needs. The LLT will support and participate in classroom demonstrations and modeling of research-based reading strategies, and will mentor other teachers through staff development and learning communities. The LLT will monitor, support, and mentor core content-area teachers in their integration of literacy strategies and reading instructional practices. The LLT will also model, present, and monitor the implementation of the five school-wide literacy strategies (vocabulary flashcards, chunking, marginal notes, summarizing, and text structures) to promote a school-wide culture of literacy. Similarly, the LLT will develop, share, and monitor the implementation of a school-wide literacy initiative directly aligned to the Common Core Standards which focuses on the integration of reading strategies in all of the core content areas. The LLT will provide staff development aligned to this initiative and will provide modeling and mentoring for content-area teachers.

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.

n/a

*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.

All teachers will receive guidance, and training (if needed) to incorpoate reading strategies across all content areas. The LLT has established three main reading strategies to implement school-wide this year (marginal notes, chunking, and using question stems). All teachers will incorporate these strategies into their IFC's and lesson plans. LLT memebers will provide professional development sessions (focusing on these three strategies) for teachers who need additional support. The LLT will monitor and evaluate the progress of the implementation of these reading strategies in all classrooms. Members of the LLT also supports teachers going through the Reading Endorsement and/or CAR-PD process by coaching the teachers through the process, guiding teachers with the integration of reading strategies into their curriculum, providing support for in-class implementation, and monitoring and evaluating the progress of the teacher's RE or CAR-PD process. This ensures that proper implementation of the reading strategies is evident in classrooms. The school Reading Coaches provide one-on-one guidance and support for teachers as well.

*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?

Piper provides integrated courses through OJT, internships, and technical education. The school supports the workforce component of each Career/Technical program by exposing the students to work-related fields congruent to the courses offered. We have paired reading, math, and science instructional strategies across content areas in order to create relevancy to students and real-life application. The CTE programs that offer industry certification are: Culinary, Web Design, Fashion Design, Marketing, Auto Technology, Communications Technology, and Engineering.

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?

Course progression is completed through guidance review of student schedules and learning needs and meeting with each student during registration. Career fairs, guidance articulation, vertical teaming with the middle schools all contribute to promoting responsible student course selections. Student data chats and interim chats are also part of the process to bring academic awareness to our students.

The progression is reviewed by the Principal and administration yearly through district reports to ensure that sequential coursework is completed in order to become eligible for state certification and Bright Futures Scholarship in Career planning as well as meeting the high school graduation requirements and student potential.

All guidance counselors and the college advisor (BRACE) units allocated to our school are required to have face-to-face interaction with their respective students during the registration process. Counselors are required to promote the SAT, ACT, FCAT, and AP Exam Preperatory after-school tutoring programs to all students. In addition, Reading Plus is implemented to promote reading fluency.

PSAT, EOC, FCAT, PERT, SAT/ACT results are used for post-secondary planning when scores are returned to students. At this time guidance has a presentation that demonstrates how students can interpret their scores and to project what their future SAT scores would/should be. The students' original test book is returned to them along with the correct answers so that students can review their mistakes. ePEP, Choices, and FACTS.org are used as planning guides for students in their future. Students are shown how to use these resources and can access these online, free-of-charge, and at any time in order to assist them with their future planning.

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

As part of our transitioning process and to facilitate career/post-secondary planning, guidance uses FACTS.org and EPEP completion. All guidance counselors and the college advisor (BRACE) allocated to our school are used. The college advisor (BRACE) collects post-secondary data from students throughout the year.

Piper maximizes fee wavers for SAT/ACT college applications for students that meet eligibility requirements. PSAT is offered to all tenth graders. PERT is offered to all 11th / 12th graders.

Piper provides four guidance nights that exhibit post-secondary options, financial aid planning, test-taking strategies, and career/technical programs available to parents.

Through awards ceremonies Piper honors students abilities to excel in the areas of: Honor Roll, Top Ten Percent, and Subject Area achievement.

To promote post-secondary education, Piper High has an annual career fair as well as a college tour that visits multiple universities throughout the state of Florida. Students are to register for this tour which takes place over a three day period in which they travel by bus to view schools of interest.

CTACE follows all program requirements and is aligned to the CTE 5-year strategic plan.

Piper aligns eligible students with vocational and technical interests to Sheridan Technical Center and Atlantic Technical Center as a shared high school experience.

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:	By June 2012,25% (268) of level 3 students will make learning gains in Reading on the FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (234)	25% (268)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches Teachers	Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Vocabulary deficit, specifically multiple meanings and word relationships	Interactive word walls; Study flashcards; Concept word maps; Direct instruction and practice of types of context clues; Teacher modeling; Push-in coaching support; Lesson Study	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Richard Wells English Department Chair); Donovan Collins/ Vanessa Pinzon (Social Studies Department Chairs)	RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Minutes and Records of Lesson Study; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats	Mini-Benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
	Deficiencies in higher order thinking	Differentiated Instructional strategies	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/	RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated	Mini-Benchmark assessments;

3	Skills (Synthesis and Drawing Conclusions)	focusing on analysis, synthesis, and drawing conclusions; Cooperative learning; Drawing conclusions graphic organizers; Summarizing; Note taking; Exit/admit slips; Teacher modeling; Push-in coaching support; Lesson Study	Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Richard Wells English Department Chair); Donovan Collins/ Vanessa Pinzon (Social Studies Department Chairs)	strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Minutes and Records of Lesson Study; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats	Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
4	Integration of Reading strategies in English and Social Studies core classes	Teacher-modeling; Push-in coaching support; School-wide selected reading strategies (Vocabulary flashcards, marginal note-taking; summarizing; chunking; text structures); Context clues and multiple meaning strategies; Summarizing strategies and graphic organizers; Lesson Study	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Richard Wells English Department Chair); Donovan Collins/ Vanessa Pinzon (Social Studies Department Chairs)	RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Minutes and Records of Lesson Study; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats	Mini-Benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	By June 2013, 50% (9) of students scoring at the supported level of complexity (levels 4, 5, 6) will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38%(7)	50%(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	Differentiated instructional for multiple exceptionalities	Documented weekly practice using lesson plans including differentiated instruction methods and incorporating the FAA testing format on school-based assessments. Follow and monitor Individual Student Learning Plans	Assistant Principal ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Weekly classroom observations Teacher follow-up teacher and student data chats	IEP meetings Practice Test Results Parent / Student Surveys and Questionnaires for feedback
2	Differentiated instructional techniques for multiple exceptionalities	Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
3	Classes with multiple exceptionalities	Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2012,17% (182) will make learning gains in Reading on the FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (148)	17% (182)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Ability to critically analyze and synthesize complex and multiple texts at once.	Focus on analysis, synthesis, and evaluation type tasks such as: summarizing, note-taking, visualization; Student generated higher order questions using stems; Student generated rubrics; Socratic seminar; Teacher modeling; Lesson study; Authentic opportunities and formative snapshots such as graphic organizers	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	Minutes and Records of Lesson Study; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Student work sample collection and review; Student-teacher data chats; Formative and summative rubrics	Weekly assessments; BAT; FAIR; FCAT 2.0; CWT data
3	Vocabulary deficit, specifically multiple meanings and word relationships	Interactive word walls; Concept word maps; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on multiple meanings of words; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on word relationships (synonyms and antonyms); Student generated vocabulary questions using stems; Teacher modeling;	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	Minutes and Records of Lesson Study; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Student work sample collection and review; Student-teacher data chats; Formative and summative rubrics	Weekly assessments; BAT; FAIR; FCAT 2.0; CWT data

		Lesson Study			
4	Lack of and/or weak in literature and poetry analysis and interpretation skills	Socratic Seminar; Strategies such as TPCAST, and SOAPSTONE; Teacher modeling; Student generated higher order questions using stems; Authentic opportunities and formative snapshots such as graphic organizer; Lesson Study	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	Minutes and Records of Lesson Study ; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Student work sample collection and review; Student-teacher data chats; Formative and summative rubrics	Weekly assessments; BAT; FAIR; FCAT 2.0; CWT 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:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By June 2013, 58% (11) will make learning gains in Reading on the FAA Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (10)	58% (11)

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	Differentiated instructional for multiple exceptionalities	Documented weekly practice using lesson plans including differentiated instruction methods and incorporating the FAA testing format on school-based assessments. Follow and monitor Individual Student Learning Plans	Assistant Principal ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Weekly classroom observations Teacher follow-up teacher and student data chats	IEP meetings Practice / Stamina Test Results Parent / Student Surveys and Questionnaires for feedback
2	2b.1 Differentiated instructional techniques for classes with multiple exceptionalities	2b.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	2b.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	2b.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	2b.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
3	2b.2. Classes with multiple exceptionalities	2b.2. Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans (IEP).	2b.2. Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	2b.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	2b.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2012, 48% (560) of students will make learning gains in Reading on the FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

45% (528)	48% (560)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Vocabulary deficit, specifically context clues, multiple meanings, word relationships, and word structure	Interactive word walls; Implementation of “Vocabulary Through Morphemes” district-approved program; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on using words in context; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on word relationships (synonyms/antonyms); Direct instruction and practice of types of context clues, word parts, word structure analysis, and multiple meaning concepts; Modeling and practice of vocabulary question analysis; Student generated vocabulary questions using stems; Teacher modeling	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Ongoing progress monitoring through “Vocabulary Through Morphemes” program’s integrated assessments; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of Weekly common planning; Lesson Plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
3	Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	Differentiated instruction; Peer-coaching; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased use of non-linguistic representations to help students represent and elaborate on knowledge and concepts; Use of higher	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of Weekly common planning; Teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data

		order question stems and cues; Integration of student self-assessment strategies		review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	
4	Lack of student motivation in Retake Courses	Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased individualized differentiated instruction; Reinforcing student effort and providing recognition on an ongoing basis; Involve selected students to contribute to class choices of reading that thematically pair with the district reading program; Class competitions of mini-benchmark assessments on a monthly basis; School-wide strategies will be focused on when using the selected texts (summarizing, marginal notes, chunking, vocabulary flashcards, text structures). Also, involve selected students in motivational pull-out sessions and/or individualized student-teacher chats in order to progress monitor motivation, attitude, and engagement.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Monitoring progress and data from class competitions; Student sample collection and review; Regular and ongoing student-teacher data chats; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	By June 2013, 92% (17) of students will make learning gains in Reading on the FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (16)	92% (17)

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	Differentiated instructional for multiple exceptionalities	Documented weekly practice using lesson plans including differentiated instruction methods and incorporating the FAA testing format on school-based assessments. Follow and monitor Individual Student Learning Plans	Assistant Principal ESE Specialist	Weekly classroom observations Teacher follow-up teacher and student data chats	IEP meetings Practice Test Results Parent / Student Surveys and Questionnaires for feedback
	3b.1 Differentiated	3b.1 Documented weekly	3b.1 Classroom	3b.1 Biweekly CWTs	3b.1 2013 FAA results

2	instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	Teacher, ESE Specialist	that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	and Practice stamina tests.
3	3b.2. Classes with multiple exceptionalities	3b.2. Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans. 3b.2. Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	3b.2 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	3b.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	3b.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2012, 47% (144) of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the FCAT reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (135)	47% (144)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
	Vocabulary deficit, specifically context clues, multiple meanings, word relationships, and word structure	Interactive word walls; Implementation of REWARDS and REWARDS Plus district-approved program; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on using words in context; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on word relationships (synonyms/antonyms);	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Ongoing progress monitoring through REWARDS and REWARDS Plus programs; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Lesson	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data

2		Direct instruction and practice of types of context clues, word parts, word structure analysis, and multiple meaning concepts; Direct instruction, modeling, and practice of vocabulary question analysis; Student generated vocabulary questions using stems; Teacher modeling		Plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	
3	Lack of student motivation and difficulty maintaining student engagement in class	Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased individualized differentiated instruction; Reinforcing student effort and providing recognition on an ongoing basis; Involve selected students to contribute to class choices of reading that thematically pair with the district reading program. Class competitions of mini-benchmark assessment results with prizes awarded monthly to winning classes; School-wide strategies will be focused on when using the selected texts (summarizing, marginal notes, chunking, vocabulary flashcards, text structures). Also, involve selected students in motivational pull-out sessions and/or individualized student-teacher chats in order to progress monitor motivation, attitude, and engagement.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Monitoring progress and data from class competitions; Student sample collection and review; Regular and ongoing student-teacher chats; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
4	Lack of and/or weak in analysis and synthesis skills	Focus on analysis and synthesis, type tasks such as: summarizing, note-taking and visualization; Increased use of student generated higher order questions using stems; Increase use of drawing conclusions graphic organizers and notetaking strategies; Exit/admit slips; Integration of student-self assessment strategies; Teacher modeling	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Weekly common planning; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data

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 : Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	FCAT Level 3 or	FCAT Level 3 or	FCAT Level 3 or	FCAT Level 3 or	FCAT Level 3 or	

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:	By June 2012,49% (126)of White Students,33% (223) of Black Students, 46% (96) of Hispanic Students, 53% (24)of Asian Students, and 64% (3)of American Indian Students will make AYP in reading on the FCAT reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White Students= 43% (112) Black Students= 25% (168) Hispanic Students= 40% (84) Asian = 47% (25) Amer. Indian= 60% (3)	White Students=49% (126) Black Students=33% (223) Hispanic Students=46% (96) Asian =53% (24) Amer. Indian=64% (3)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	Differentiated instruction; Peer-coaching; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased use of non-linguistic representations to help students represent and elaborate on knowledge and concepts; Use of higher order question stems and cues; Integration of	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data

		student self-assessment strategies; Increase use of authentic assessments and rubrics		review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	
3	Weak in identifying supporting details, determining the main idea, making generalizations, and drawing conclusions	Reading application and summarizing strategies such as: QAR, Think-Alouds, Chunking, Summarizing, Note-taking, Think- Pair-Share, Synthesis web with summary, and a Venn Diagram with Summary; Student generated higher order questions using stems; Increased use of authentic assessments to make connections to the real-world; Teacher modeling.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
4	Modifying instruction in the core classes based on the ongoing progress monitoring of the FAIR assessment	Increased integration of FAIR progress monitoring strategies in core curriculum; Student-teacher data chats after each FAIR assessment period; Increased integration of the progress monitoring differentiated instructional strategies based on FAIR data such as reteaching,providingstudent feedback, fluency practice with timed readings, and using questions and cues to increase inferential skills.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Donovan Collins (Social Studies Department Chair); Patrick Lowe (Administrator); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Implementation of FAIR toolkit assessments; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Lesson Study; Student sample collection and review; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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 subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2012, 19% (13) of ELL students will make AYP in reading on the FCAT reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (7)	19% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades

1		Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.			Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	Differentiated instruction; Peercoaching; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased use of nonlinguistic representations to help students represent and elaborate on knowledge and concepts; Use of higher order question stems and cues; Integration of student self-assessment strategies; Increase use of authentic assessments and rubrics	Miriam Udell Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone Administrator); Patrick Lowe Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Monthly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; CELLA; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
3	Test taking skills and awareness	Practice with timed assignments; Immediate feedback on progress; Regular and ongoing student-teacher chats to discuss progress, challenges, goals, and test logistics; Remediation through teacher modeling; Co-teaching model at a Tier 2 Level; Plan and implement appropriate testing environment according to documented accommodations	Miriam Udell Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone Administrator); Patrick Lowe Administrator)	RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning chats; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Monthly mini-benchmark assessments; practice stamina tests; CELLA; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
4	Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking	Rosetta Stone computer-based program	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	Ongoing monitoring and data analysis; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; RtI; Teacher-student data and feedback chats; Records of teacher-administrator-department chair data chats	Continuous monitoring through Rosetta Stone Program; CELLA; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2012, 23% (31) of students with disabilities will make AYP on the FCAT Reading Assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (19)	23% (31)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	Provide daily instruction in a scientifically based multi-sensory program in addition to core reading program requirements; Differentiated instruction; Peer coaching; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum; Increased use of nonlinguistic representations to help students represent and elaborate on knowledge and concepts; Use of higher order question stems and cues; Integration of student self-assessment strategies; Increase use of authentic assessments and rubrics; ongoing systematic communication and collaboration among ESE providers, general education teachers and coaches.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records of Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
	Test taking skills; test-	Practice with timed	Miriam Udell	Ongoing progress	Bi-weekly mini-

3	taking awareness and climate	assignments; Immediate feedback on progress; Regular and ongoing student-teacher chats to discuss progress, challenges, goals, and test logistics; Remediation through teacher modeling; Co-teaching model at a Tier 2 Level; Plan and implement appropriate testing environment according to documented accommodations; ongoing systematic communication and collaboration among ESE providers, general education teachers and coaches.	(Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator) Jaime Morales (ESE Specialist)	monitoring through designated ESE support staff; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning chats; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
4	Retention of Information; Reading Comprehension and Application Skills	Differentiated instructional strategies focusing on Category two (comprehension and reading application)such as: QAR, preview/ predict charts, KWL, two-column notes, anticipation guides, and think-pair-share; Summarizing strategies such as, exit slips, synthesis webs, and ticket-outs; Increased use of curriculum-aligned games; Increased use of non-linguistic representations; Increased use of think alouds; Increased use of authentic assessments to make connections to real-world; Teacher modeling; ongoing systematic communication and collaboration among ESE providers, general education teachers and coaches.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2012, 37% (275) of economically disadvantaged students will make AYP on the FCAT reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (219)	37% (275)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
	2	Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	Differentiated instruction; Peer coaching; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum;	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data
	3	Retention of Information; Reading Comprehension and Application Skills	Differentiated instructional strategies focusing on Category two (comprehension and reading application)such as: preview/ predict charts, two-column notes, anticipation guides, and think-pair-share; Summarizing strategies such as, exit slips, synthesis webs, and ticket-outs; Increased use of curriculum aligned games; Increased use of nonlinguistic representations; Increased use of think alouds; Increased use of authentic assessments to make connections to real world; Teacher modeling; ongoing systematic communication and collaboration among ELL teachers, coordinator,	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Formative and summative rubrics; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Records of teacher data chats with administration and department chair, monthly; Lesson plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT data

		and reading coach.			
4	Vocabulary deficit, specifically word origins, structure, analysis	Interactive word walls; Implementation of the "Vocabulary through Morphemes" district approved program; Vocabulary flashcards focusing on word origins, structures, and various uses; Direct instruction and practice of morphology; Direct instruction and practice of word parts and word structure analysis; Student generated Vocabulary questions using stems; Teacher modeling; ongoing systematic communication and collaboration among ELL teachers, coordinator, and reading coach.	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)	Ongoing progress monitoring through the "Vocabulary through Morphemes" program's assessments; RtI; Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow up teacher chats and action plans; Records and Recaps of weekly common planning; Lesson Plan review; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats	Bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments; Practice stamina tests; FCAT 2.0; BAT; FAIR; CWT 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
Reading Common Planning and Lesson Study	9-12	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair)	9th -12th Reading teachers (9 teachers)	Weekly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	Group Assessment Data Analysis; Weekly follow-up reports via email; One-on-One feedback sessions discussing data, student progress, teacher plans, IFC alignment, and strategy implementation; RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Bobby Goodwin (Administrator); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)
Reading and Core Teacher Teaming and Mentoring	9-10	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair)	9th -10th Reading and English teachers (28 teachers)	Monthly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	Group Assessment Data Analysis; Monthly follow-up reports via email; Group feedback sessions discussing data, student progress, teacher plans, IFC alignment, and strategy implementation;	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Bobby Goodwin (Administrator); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)

					RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	
Reading and Core Teacher Teaming and Mentoring Reading Best Practices	9-12	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/ Department Chair)	9th -12th Reading teachers (9 teachers)	Weekly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	Weekly follow-up reports via email; Biweekly CWTs with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Assessment Data Analysis; One-on-One feedback sessions with teachers discussing strategies and data and planning for coaching support when needed; RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Bobby Goodwin (Administrator); Patrick Lowe (Administrator)

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Practice Sessions for Students – Online test preparation and assessment feedback / data reports	Florida Achieves Website florida-achieves.org	n/a	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Fluency program Online software program (remedial & enrichment)	Reading Plus	School-funded	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	9th Grade - 35% (11 students) 10th Grade - 52% (17 students) 11th Grade - 48% (14 students) 12th Grade - 48% (12 students)
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
9th Grade - 28% (9 students) 10th Grade - 44% (15 students) 11th Grade - 40% (12 students) 12th Grade - 40% (10 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	1.1. Due to language barriers, there is a vocabulary deficit, specifically multiple meanings and word relationships	1.1. Interactive word walls; Study flashcards; Concept word maps; Direct instruction and practice of types of context clues; Teacher modeling; Push-in coaching support by ESOL support facilitators; Lesson Study	1.1. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	1.1. Rosetta Stone (two times each week) with follow up teacher chats; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats	1.1. Mini-benchmark vocabulary assessments (biweekly); Oral Presentations (monthly); Student work sample collection and review; IPT; CELLA
2	1.2. Lack of and/or weak in identifying idiomatic expressions	1.2. Explicit decoding of idiomatic expressions; Direct instruction; interactive practice with use of phrasal verbs; Teacher modeling	1.2. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	1.2. Rosetta Stone (two times each week) with follow up teacher chats; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats	1.2. Idiom quizzes; Oral Presentations (monthly); Student work sample collection and review; IPT; CELLA
3	1.3. Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student needs, within one classroom	1.3. Differentiated instruction; Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum through the use of Rosetta Stone and the English Now! program; Increased use of non-linguistic representations to help students represent and elaborate on knowledge and concepts; Increase use of student presentations as assessments and student friendly rubrics	1.3. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator) Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	1.3. Rosetta Stone (two times each week) with follow up teacher chats; Student sample collection and review; Student feedback and data chats Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	1.3. Mock FCAT Reading passage practice (monthly); Ongoing progress monitoring through Mini-benchmark assessments (monthly); Student work sample collection and review; Oral Presentations (monthly); IPT; CELLA

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:	9th Grade - 11% (3 students) 10th Grade - 26% (8 students) 11th Grade - 30% (9 students) 12th Grade - 20% (5 students)

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

9th Grade - 3% (1 students)
10th Grade - 18% (6 students)
11th Grade - 23% (7 students)
12th Grade - 12% (3 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	Anticipated Barrier 2.1. Lack of and/or weak synthesis and evaluation Skills	Strategy 2.1. Focus on analysis, synthesis, and evaluation type tasks such as: summarizing, note-taking, visualization; Student generated higher order questions using stems that align with common core and FCAT 2.0; Teacher generated rubrics; Teacher modeling; use of graphic organizers	2.1. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	2.1. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Student work sample collection and review; Student-teacher data chats; Formative and summative rubrics	Evaluation Tool 2.1. Biweekly assessments; CELLA, IPT; FCAT 2.0; CWT data
2	2.2. Lack of and/or weak in literary analysis and interpretation skills	2.2. TPCAST, and SOAPSTONE; Teacher modeling; Student generated higher order questions using stems that align with common core and FCAT 2.0; use of graphic organizers	2.2. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	2.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Student work sample collection and review; Student-teacher data chats; Formative and summative rubrics	2.2. Biweekly assessments; CELLA, IPT; FCAT 2.0; CWT data

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	9th Grade - 24% (7 students) 10th Grade - 26% (8 students) 11th Grade - 35% (10 students) 12th Grade - 24% (6 students)

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

9th Grade - 16% (5 students)
10th Grade - 18% (6 students)
11th Grade - 27% (8 students)
12th Grade - 16% (4 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	3.1. Understanding the rules of English syntax.	3.1. Side-by-side presentation of home-language sentences with English translations; practice structuring sentences with manipulatives.	3.1. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	3.1. Bi-weekly collection and evaluation of student sentence structuring practice. Student conferencing/pull-out/push-in support as needed, arranged by ELL coordinator.	3.1. Monthly writing assessment, student work sample collection and review, CELLA, Teacher-student data chats
	3.2. Using effective transitional words and phrases to organize as	3.2. Transitional words and phrases exercises, such as appropriate	3.2. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department	3.2. Collection and evaluation of Student Samples by grade-level	3.2. Monthly writing assessment,

2	per Six Traits model.	pairing of transitional words and phrases to a variety of organizational patterns in writing; instruction of the use of correct verb tenses and modeling of writing framework.	Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator)	teams with Department Chair on a bi-weekly basis. Student conferencing with teachers in order to decipher which students need additional assistance through the pull-out process. Student-to-student peer editing/conferencing.	student work sample collection and review, CELLA, Teacher-student data chats
3	3.3. Instructing students to make “layered” and “extended” paragraphs into elaborated body paragraphs.	3.3. Student identification of “elaborated” paragraphs versus “layered” and “extended” paragraphs using student samples, followed by paragraph elaboration practice through revision of previously-completed essays; instruction of the use of correct verb tenses and modeling of writing framework.	3.3. Miriam Udell (Reading Coach/Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator); Angel Miranda (ESOL Teacher/Coordinator).	3.3. Collection and evaluation of Student Samples by grade-level teams with Department Chair on a bi-weekly basis. Student conferencing with teachers in order to decipher which students need additional assistance through the pull-out process. Student-to-student peer editing/conferencing.	3.3. Monthly writing assessment, student work sample collection and review, CELLA, Teacher-student data chats

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/ FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's		$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/FCAT/CTE curriculum	District Workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	School funded	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $4,000.00

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:	By June 2013 41% (7) students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (7)	41% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1 Differentiated instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	1b.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
2	1b.2 Classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.2. Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	1b.2. Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2013, 58% (10) of the students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (10)	58%(10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1 Differentiated instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	1b.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.

2	1b.2 Classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.2 Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	1b.2 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.2 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2013, 81% of the students will make Learning Gains in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (14)	81% (14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1 Differentiated instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	1b.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
2	1b.2. Classes with multiple exceptionalities	1b.2. Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	1b.2. Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1b.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1b.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2013, 52% (269) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(255)	52% (269

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches Teachers	Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	1.1. Student retention of previous math skills	1.1. Spiral curriculum is used to review basic math skills. Use of Promethean board, hands on manipulatives, and group work	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 1.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.1. Teacher made assessments are analyzed and reviewed by teacher/team/department chairs. Monitoring/feedback procedures/classroom walkthroughs Professional Study Day discussion and best practices	1.1. Teacher-made weekly assessments, student work
3	1.2. Lack of basic computation skills	1.2. Practice basic skills such as (but not limited to) fractions, decimals, rounding. Increase knowledge of math terminology	1.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.2. Pre-test to determine proficiency Teacher assessments graded and analyzed by teachers	1.2. Diagnostic test, teacher made assessments
4	1.3. Ninth grade transition from FCAT to EOC	1.3. Use of EOC reference sheet in class. Use of EOC practice materials in class	1.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.3. Student work reviewed and progress is momitored by unit topic; quarterly student data chats. Professional Study Day discussion and best practices	1.3. Teacher-made weekly assessments, BAT, EOC, samples of student work

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:	By June 2013, 18% (93) of the students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (79)	18% (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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	2.1. Student retention of previous math skills	2.1. Spiral curriculum is used to review basic math skills in order to move onto college readiness curriculum	2.1 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	2.1 Teacher assessments are analyzed and reviewed by teacher/team/department chairs	2.1 Teacher-made weekly assessments.
3	2.2. Students struggle with the transitions from middle school to high school math	2.2. Spiral curriculum, common grading, planning and assessments Ninth grade orientation offered to parents to acquaint then with course offerings, supplies needed, study skills, parent involvement, athletics and clubs	2.2 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator; Guidance Counselors.	2.2. Pre-test (diagnostic); collaborative planning across algebra and geometry areas; team syllabi	2.2. Diagnostic test, team minutes
4	2.3 Ninth grade transition from FCAT to EOC	2.3 Use of EOC reference sheet in class. Use of EOC practice materials in class	2.3 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	2.3 Student work reviewed and progress is monitored by unit topic; quarterly student data chats. Professional Study Day discussion and best practices	2.3 Teacher-made weekly assessments, BAT, EOC, samples of student 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 # 3A : By June 2017, Piper High School will reduce our achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	EOC Algebra Le	EOC Algebra Le	EOC Algebra Le	EOC Algebra Le	EOC Algebra Le	

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:	By June 2013, White:22% (24) Black: 39% (115) Hispanic:23% (20) Asian: 24% (2) American Indian:30% (1) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 25% (28) Black: 42% (125) Hispanic: 26% (23) Asian: 27% (3) American Indian: 33% (1)	White:22% (24) Black: 39% (115) Hispanic:23% (20) Asian: 24% (2) American Indian:30% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	3B.1. Individualizing student learning based on specific and varied student needs within one classroom	3B.1. Training teachers on differentiated learning strategies using best practices; teacher-to-teacher mentoring; learning style inventory Cooperative learning; integration of instructional technology such as promethean boards and Pearson online resources in the	3B.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3B.1. Review of student grades; assessments; teacher data chats	3B.1. Weekly assessments, BAT, reports generatoed by Pearson online resources

		curriculum			
3	3B.2. Consistent monitoring of student data by both teachers and students	3B.2. Provide teachers with virtual counselor training; provide students with data chats to create awareness of their strengths and weaknesses	3B.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3B.2. Conduct teacher/student data reviews	3B.2 Data chat forms
4	3B.3. Lack of basic computation skills	3B.3. Practice basic skills such as (but not limited to) fractions, decimals, rounding. Increase knowledge of math terminology	3B.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3B.3. Pre-test to determine proficiency Teacher assessments graded and analyzed by teachers	3B.3. Diagnostic test, teacher made 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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	By June 2013, 53% (13) English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (14)	53% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	3C.1. Limited vocabulary development necessary for mathematics comprehension	3C.1. Implementing vocabulary development activities such as student created word walls and index	3C.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator;	3C.1. Review assessments and student assignments stressing vocabulary and basic math terms	3C.1. Weekly assessments, BAT

		cards (flash cards) Analyzing key words in word problems	Patrick Lowe, Administrator	Progression towards word problems	
3	3C.2. Specific language and cultural barriers impede student understanding of instruction	3C.2. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)	3C.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3C.2. Review of student work samples; assessment analysis; data chats	3C.2. Weekly classroom assessments, EOC, BAT
4	3C3 Student ability to apply math to real world relevance	3C3 Integrating technology into math curriculum as a teaching and re-teaching tool; provide staff development in the use of technology such as promethean boards	3C.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3C.3. Classroom walkthroughs to monitor student achievement/retention, general feedback via email and department meetings Team planning	3C.3. Classroom walkthroughs, BAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios

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:	By June 2013, 35% (121) Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (132)	35% (121)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	3E.1. Students lack the technology resources needed to become more proficient in math	3E.1 Student exposure to technology such as four function calculators, scientific calculators, graphing calculators, smart boards, overhead projectors, laptops Teachers will be supplied with a class set of all calculators and access to all other technology equipment	3E.1 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator.	3E.1. In teacher planning sessions, conduct lesson plan study and review students results on assessments/assignments on a weekly basis Classroom walkthroughs on days designated for student data chats General feedback via email and department meetings Action plan will be generated through department meetings and the use of our school's leadership team	3E.1. Weekly assessments, weekly student grades, BAT, EOC
	3E.2. Individualizing student learning based on specific, varied student	3E.2 Training teachers on differentiated learning strategies using best	3E.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs;	3E.2. Review of student grades; assessments; teacher data chats	3E.1. Weekly assessments,

3	needs, within one classroom	practices; teacher-to-teacher mentoring; learning style inventory Cooperative learning; Integration of instructional technology in the curriculum	Patrick Lowe, Administrator.	Classroom walkthroughs on days designated for student data chats General feedback via email and department meetings Action plan will be generated through department meetings and the use of our school's leadership team	weekly student grades, BAT, EOC 3E.2. Weekly assessments, BAT, CWT, EOC
4	3E.3 Student confidence in math abilities due to a lack of background knowledge in this area.	3E.3 Spiral curriculum, classroom student interaction at the board, teacher praise, collaborative groups, differentiated instruction, data chats to promote student confidence.	3E.3 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3E.3 Review of student grades, attendance, and homework completion Classroom walkthroughs on days designated for student data chats General feedback via email and department meetings Action plan will be generated through department meetings and the use of our school's leadership team General feedback via email and department meetings Action plan will be generated through department meetings and the use of our school's leadership team	3E.3 Weekly teacher-made assessments, monitor student grades and attendance on Pinnacle (weekly), BAT, weekly 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:	By June 2013, 46% (247) Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (237)	46% (247)

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
	Student deficiencies in	Teachers will receive	Assistant	Evaluation of student	Fair Testing Data

1	vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Principals Instructional Coaches Teachers	work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	1.1. Student retention of previous math skills	1.1. Spiral curriculum is used to review basic math skills. Us of promethean board, hands on manipulatives and group work	1.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.1. Teacher made assessments are analyzed and reviewed by teacher/team Professional study day discussion and best practices	1.1. Teacher-made weekly assessmemts, student work
3	1.2. Student lack of familiarity with online interface in preparing for EOC	1.2. Review of EOC reference sheet and scientific calculator in lab and classroom setting Use of ePat and computer practice tests	1.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.2. Review scores on BAT, data chats and review of instructional focus calendar. Use laptop carts and labs for technology integration	1.2. Weekly classroom assessments, BAT, EOC, Epat
4	1.3. Lack of experience in preparing for the Geometry EOC	1.3. Teachers will receive additional training on Test Item Specs Review of EOC reference sheet and scientific calculator in lab and class setting Use of ePat and computer practice tests.	1.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	1.3. Review scores on BAT, and classroom assessment; data chats, review of instructional focus calendar. Use of laptop carts and labs for practice tests and ePat.	1.3. Weekly classroom assessments, BAT EOC, ePat

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:	By June 2013, 24% (129) students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (116)	24% (129)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	2.1. Unfamiliarity with scientific calculators	2.1. Teachers have class sets of the TI30XS multiview calculator that is used on the Geometry EOC Scientific calculators will be used on class assignments, homework, assessments	2.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator; classroom teacher	2.1. Use of calculator and calculator practice assignments	2.1. Classroom assignments, assessments, EOC, ePat
3	2.2. Student confidence	2.2. Spiral curriculum and warm-ups to reinforce algebra skills	2.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	2.2. Daily warm-ups and spiral questions reviewed in class	2.2. Journals, teacher made assessments
4	2.3 Limited experience in geometry	2.3 Implement practice with geometry word problems as warm-ups	2.3 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	2.3 Samples of student work review by team	2.3 Teacher made weekly assessments and student 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%.

Geometry Goal #

3A : By 2017, Piper High School will reduce our achievement gap by 50%.

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

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:	By June 2013, White: 22% (28) Black: 38% (110) Hispanic:30% (29) Asian: 5% (1) American Indian: n/a student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 25% (33) Black: 41% (121) Hispanic: 33% (32) Asian: 8% (1) American Indian: n/a	White: 22% (28) Black: 38% (110) Hispanic:30% (29) Asian: 5% (1) American Indian: 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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	3B.1. Student motivation for participating in geometrical concepts and online activities	3B.1. Individualized student tutoring, co-teaching, class competition between classes, student data chats, and individualized student conferences.	3B.1 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3B.1. Review scores on BAT CWT General feedback via email and department meetings Action plan will be generated through department meetings and the use of our leadership team	3B.1. Weekly assessments, BAT
	3B.2. Individualizing student	3B.2. Training teachers on	3B.2. Jacalyn Stein,	3B.2. Review of student	3B.2. Weekly

3	learning based on specific and varied student needs within one classroom	differentiated learning strategies using best practices; teacher-to-teacher mentoring; learning style inventory Cooperative learning; integration of instructional technology such as promethean boards	Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	grades; assessments; teacher data chats	assessments, BAT

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:	By June 2013, 53% (16) English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (17)	53% (16)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	3C.1. Limited vocabulary development necessary for mathematics comprehension	3C.1. Implementing vocabulary development activities such as student created word walls and index cards (flash cards) Analyzing key words in	3C.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3C.1. Review assessments and student assignments stressing vocabulary and basic math terms Progression towards word problems	3C.1. Weekly assessments, BAT

		word problems			
3	3C.2. Specific language and cultural barriers impede student understanding of instruction	3C.2. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)	3C.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3C.2. Review of student sample work; assessment analysis; data chats	3C.2. Classroom assessments, EOC,BAT
4	3C.3. Student ability to apply information learned to real world relevance	3C.3. Integrating technology into math curriculum as a teaching and re-teaching tool; provide staff development in the use of technology such as promethean boards and Geogebra/	3C.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; ESOL Coordinator; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3C.3. CWT to monitor student achievement, feedback via email and department meetings Team planning	3C.2. Classroom assessments, EOC,BAT 3C.3. CWT, BAT

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:	By June 2013, 55% (26) Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%(28)	55% (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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
	3D.1. Student ability to understand and choose vital information from Word Problems	3D.1. Warm-ups in Word Problem form and remediation of weaknesses	3D.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs;Jamie Morales, ESE	3D.1. Classroom walk-through to monitor student achievement and retention	3D.1. CWT, BAT, EOC

2		Use visual vocabulary such as word walls and index cards. Peer-collaborative learning Ongoing system communication and collaboration among ESE providers and general education teachers Peer support/cooperative learning	Specialist; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	General feedback via e-mail and department meetings Teacher assessment, data chats with students	
3	3D.2. Decrease in teacher/student contact time due to change from block scheduling to seven periods	3D.2. Teachers push in to other classrooms to help students	3D.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Jamie Morales, ESE Specialist; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3D.2. Classroom walkthroughs, data chats	3D.2. Weekly teacher assessments, BAT, EOC
4	3D.3. Student ability to understand and choose vital information from work problems	3D.3. Geometry warm-ups in word problem form and remediation of weaknesses Use visual vocabulary such as word walls and index cards	3D.3. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept Chairs; Jamie Morales, ESE Specialist; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3D.3. CWT to monitor student achievement, retention. General feedback via emails and team meetings	3D.3. CWT, BAT, weekly assessments, EOC

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:	By June 2013, 34% (122) Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (133)	34%(122)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas.	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches	Teachers Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios

		School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.			
2	3E.1. Students lack the technology resources	3E.1. Student exposure to technology such as scientific calculators, laptops Teachers will be supplied with a class set of calculators and access to other technology equipment	3E.1. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3E.1. In teacher planning sessions, conduct lesson plan study and review student results on assessments/assignments on a weekly basis Classroom walk-throughs Student data chats General feedback via e-mail and department meetings	3E.1. Weekly assessments, weekly student grades, BAT, EOC
3	3E.2. Student confidence due to a lack of background knowledge in this area	3E.2 Student interaction at the board, teacher praise, collaborative groups, data chats	3E.2. Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3E.2. Review of student grades, attendance and homework completion Feedback at department meetings and team meetings	3E.2. Weekly teacher-made assessments, monitor student grades and attendance on Pinnacle, BAT
4	3E.3 Student motivation	3E.3 Student data chats	3E.3 Jacalyn Stein, Patricia Maynard, Dept chairs; Patrick Lowe, Administrator	3E.3 Review scores on Geometry BAT, CWT, general feedback via email and team meetings	3E.3 Weekly assessments

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
Test Spec Review	9-12	District trainer (HRD)	Math teachers	Professional Study Days	CWT to observe planning strategies	Department chairs, Administration
Data Analysis	9-12	Department chairs	Math teachers	Pre-planning days in August	Data chats for incoming students	Department chairs, Administration
Best Practices	9-12	Department chairs	Math teachers	Professional Study Days	CWT to observe best practice	Department chairs, Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

Practice Sessions for Students – Online test preparation and assessment feedback / data reports	BEEP Interactmath.com District-based practice test	District-based funding	$0.00
Preparation for EOC	EOC Practice Workbooks	School-based funding	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Preparation for Geometry EOC	Scientific Calculators	School-based funding	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Vertical teaming – incorporation of curricular concepts and instructional planning goals	Upgraded curriculum maps with targeted areas indicating vertical teaming incorporation – topic based	School based funding	$2,000.00
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and benchmarking of EOC / FCAT / CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning / PLC's	School based funding	$2,000.00
			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: $8,000.00

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:	By June 2013, 100% (2) Students will score at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2)	100% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1 Differentiated instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	1a.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	1a.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	1a.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	1a.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
	1a.2.	1a .2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.

2	Classes with multiple exceptionalities	Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2013, 100% (2) Students will score at or above Level 7 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	100% (2)

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 Differentiated instructional techniques in classes with multiple exceptionalities	2.1 Documented weekly practice using the FAA testing format. Demonstrate various instructional strategies based on student needs.	2.1 Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	2.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	2.1 2013 FAA results and Practice stamina tests.
2	2.2. Classes with multiple exceptionalities	2.2. Follow and monitor Individual student learning plans.	2.2. Classroom Teacher, ESE Specialist	2.2. Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with follow-up teacher chats and action plans	2.2. IEP meetings Practice Stamina Test results Parent/Teacher feedback

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:	By June 2013, 41% (117) Students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (111)	41% (117)

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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches Teachers	Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios
2	1.1. Teaching depth and breadth of content addressed on the Biology EOC (based on the 2012 EOC Test Specs) by April 2013 so current Biology students are ready for the second EOC administration in May 2013. Adjusting to new straight-seven schedule (modifying pacing of instruction, lab implementation project-based learning scope and sequence, etc.)	1.1. Aligning curriculum to EOC test specs. Review sessions offered at least two times per week after school or on Saturdays during the month preceding each E.O.C. exam. Annually assessed E.O.C. questions will be addressed first in each unit/chapter to be sure that students have met minimum requirements; biweekly meetings by biology teachers (see process?) will monitor alignment of EOC criteria with IFC/lesson plans; directives from county science office will support on target teaching/review; Intensive classes aimed at completing the information required, through after school tutoring (1x per week) and pullout sessions coordinated by science department chairpersons and classroom teacher for computer lab review by USATestPrep online program (1x per week)	1.1. Lorin Kawesch & Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	1.1. CWTs 1-2 times per week by Science Chairpersons to check alignment of scope and sequence pacing of the IFC to insure curriculum completion and alignment with EOC. Science chairpersons will discuss progress w/ each biology instructor – Pinnacle gradebook review; lesson plan review once per wk to note that curriculum scope & sequence are adhered to; student samples of free-response and lab reports will be collected and reviewed by science chairpersons after teacher has graded; RTI; weekly biology teacher common planning meetings one hour each to articulate close alignment with IFC and completion of lab investigations and assessments to track progress of class. IFC for this course represents the state curriculum calendar by topic and textbook articulation	1.1. Mini-Assessment data (county-based) and teacher-created assessments; USA Test-Prep Data; CWT data will be used to profile both intra- and inter-class progress on a weekly basis– Weak benchmarks will be noted for remediation and/or review in order to modify teaching strategies and improve student learning; weekly criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made) and software-generated tests to monitor progress within class and between class. Goal is also one of creating a standardized set of unit tests as have already been compiled w/ mid-term and final exams. All exams used will incorporate a minimum of 40% higher-order

					questions representing comprehension and application questions constructed according to Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" model
3	1.2. Students who completed Biology during the 2011-2012 school year but did not take the May, 2012 EOC (the students who were enrolled in Biology during Terms 6 & 7) need to take the EOC this year (either in November or May). They completed the course almost one year ago and the content may not be familiar.	1.2. Intensive classes aimed at completing the information required, through after school tutoring (once per week) and pullout sessions coordinated by science department chairpersons and classroom teacher for computer lab review by USA TestPrep online program (once per week)	1.2. Lorin Kawesch and Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	1.2. CWTs 1-2 times per week by Science Chairpersons to check alignment of scope and sequence pacing of the IFC to insure curriculum completion and alignment with EOC. Science chairpersons will discuss progress w/ each biology instructor – Pinnacle gradebook review; lesson plan review once per week to note that curriculum scope & sequence are adhered to; student samples of free-response and lab reports will be collected and reviewed by science chairpersons after teacher has graded; RTI; weekly biology teacher common planning meetings one hour each to articulate close alignment with IFC and completion of lab investigations and assessments to track progress of class. IFC for this course represents the state curriculum calendar by topic and textbook articulation	1.2 Mini-Assessment data (county-based) and teacher-created assessments; USA-Test Prep program data; CWT data will be used to profile both intra- and inter-class progress on a weekly basis– Weak benchmarks will be noted for remediation and/or review in order to modify teaching strategies and improve student learning; weekly criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made) and software-generated tests to monitor progress within class and between class. Goal is also one of creating a standardized set of unit tests as have already been compiled w/ mid-term and final exams. All exams used will incorporate a minimum of 40% higher-order questions representing comprehension and application questions constructed according to Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" model
4	1.3. Acquisition of vocabulary synthesizing & relationships – esoteric terms (biology)	1.3. Concept word maps; flashcards; word structure (Latin/Greek roots); word walls; graphic organizers (concept mapping); teacher modeling	1.2. Lorin Kawesch and Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator) 1.3. Lorin Kawesch and Robert	1.3. CWTs; Teacher/student "data chats"; student samples	1.3. Warm-up quizzes (daily); exit slip grade; Mini-Assessment data

			Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)		

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:	By June 2013, 32% (92) Students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (86)	32% (92)

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 Teaching depth and breadth of content addressed on the Biology EOC (based on the 2012 EOC Test Specs) by April 2013 so current Biology students are ready for the second EOC administration in May 2013. Adjusting to new straight-seven schedule (modifying pacing of instruction, lab implementation project-based learning scope and sequence, etc.)	2.1 Aligning curriculum to EOC test specs. Review sessions offered at least two times per week after school or on Saturdays during the month preceding each E.O.C. exam. Annually assessed E.O.C. questions will be addressed first in each unit/chapter to be sure that students have met minimum requirements; biweekly meetings by biology teachers (see process?) will monitor alignment of EOC criteria with IFC/lesson plans; directives from county science office will support on target teaching/review; Intensive classes aimed at completing the information required, through after school tutoring (once per week) and pullout sessions coordinated by science department chairpersons and classroom teacher for computer lab review by USA TestPrep online program (once per week)	2.1 Lorin Kawesch and Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	2.1 CWTs 1-2 times per week by Science Chairpersons to check alignment of scope and sequence pacing of the IFC to insure curriculum completion and alignment with EOC. Science chairpersons will discuss progress w/ each biology instructor – Pinnacle gradebook review; lesson plan review once per week to note that curriculum scope and sequence are adhered to; student samples of free-response and lab reports will be collected and reviewed by science chairpersons after teacher has graded; RTI; weekly biology teacher common planning meetings one hour each to articulate close alignment with IFC and completion of lab investigations and assessments to track progress of class. IFC for this course represents the state curriculum calendar by topic and textbook articulation	2.1 Mini-Assessment data (county-based) and teacher-created assessments; USA Test-Prep Data; CWT data will be used to profile both intra- and inter-class progress on a weekly basis– Weak benchmarks will be noted for remediation and/or review in order to modify teaching strategies and improve student learning; weekly criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made) and software-generated tests to monitor progress within class and between class. Goal is also one of creating a standardized set of unit tests as have already been compiled w/ mid-term and final exams. All exams used will incorporate a minimum of 40% higher-order questions representing

						comprehension and application questions constructed according to Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" model
2	2.2 Students who completed Biology during the 2011-2012 school year but did not take the May, 2012 EOC (the students who were enrolled in Biology during Terms 6 & 7) need to take the EOC this year (either in November or May). They completed the course almost one year ago and the content may not be fresh.	2.2 Intensive classes aimed at completing the information required, through after school tutoring (once per week) and pullout sessions coordinated by science department chairpersons and classroom teacher for computer lab review by USA TestPrep online program (1x per week)	2.2 Lorin Kawesch and Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	2.2 CWTs 1-2 times per week by Science Chairpersons to check alignment of scope and sequence pacing of the IFC to insure curriculum completion and alignment with EOC. Science chairpersons will discuss progress w/ each biology instructor – Pinnacle gradebook review; lesson plan review once per wk to note that curriculum scope & sequence are adhered to; student samples of free-response and lab reports will be collected and reviewed by science chairpersons after teacher has graded; RTI; weekly biology teacher common planning meetings one hour each to articulate close alignment with IFC and completion of lab investigations and assessments to track progress of class. IFC for this course represents the state curriculum calendar by topic and textbook articulation	2.2 Mini-Assessment data (county-based) and teacher-created assessments; USA-Test Prep program data; CWT data will be used to profile both intra- and inter-class progress on a weekly basis– Weak benchmarks will be noted for remediation and/or review in order to modify teaching strategies and improve student learning; weekly criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made) and software-generated tests to monitor progress within class and between class. Goal is also one of creating a standardized set of unit tests as have already been compiled w/ mid-term and final exams. All exams used will incorporate a minimum of 40% higher-order questions representing comprehension and application questions constructed according to Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" model
	2.3 Analysis, Synthesis, & Application Skills (Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" Model)	2.3 Weekly focus in classroom by the teacher, on analysis & synthesis type questions; evaluation type tasks including: summarizing, note-taking, teacher modeling. These tasks and strategies are supported by the IFC and teacher-made	2.3 Lorin Kawesch and Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	2.3 CWTs 1-2 times per week by Science Chairpersons to check alignment of scope and sequence pacing of the IFC to insure curriculum completion. Science chairpersons will discuss progress w/ each biology instructor – Pinnacle gradebook review;	2.3 Mini-Assessment data (county-based) and teacher-created assessments; CWT data will be used to profile both intra- and inter-class progress on a weekly basis– Weak

3		lesson plans which are reviewed weekly.		lesson plan review once per wk to note that curriculum scope & sequence are adhered to; student samples of free-response and lab reports will be collected and reviewed by science coach after teacher has graded; RTI; weekly biology teacher common planning meetings one hour each to articulate close alignment with IFC and completion of lab investigations and assessments to track progress of class. IFC for this course represents the state curriculum calendar by topic and textbook articulation	benchmarks will be noted for remediation and/or review in order to modify teaching strategies and improve student learning; weekly criterion-referenced tests (teacher-made) and software-generated tests to monitor progress within class and between class. Goal is also one of creating a standardized set of unit tests as have already been compiled w/ mid-term and final exams. All exams used will incorporate a minimum of 40% higher-order questions representing comprehension and application questions constructed according to Webb's "Depth of Knowledge" model

---

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
Biology E.O.C. professional development training sessions	9-10	Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Department Chairpersons) K.K. Maxwell (Science curriculum supervisor)	Biology Teachers	Once a month (every PSD day and Early Release Day)	Data chats; appraisals; lesson plan review; lab planning/review; CWT's; review of student samples	Lorin Kawesch & Robert Pearson (Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)
Common Planning & Curriculum Evaluation/Alignment & Best Practice Sharing	9-12	Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Department Chairpersons)	Science Teachers (9-12)	Bi-weekly for each subject	Review of student samples; data chats; lesson planning inclusion; lesson review; IFC review; CWT's; database of best practices	Lorin Kawesch & Robert Pearson (Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)
						Advanced

Science AP Workshops	9-12	Advanced Academics-based workshops (county designated)	Biology, Chemistry, Physics AP Teachers	Various (in and out-of-county)	IFC including College Board syllabus (audit-approved by ETS); "data chats"; lesson plans	Placement Coach; Lorin Kawesch & Robert Pearson (Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator); K.K. Maxwell (Science curriculum supervisor)

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Biology E.O.C. courses (Biology I & Biology Honors) require minimum essential lab investigations	Lab supplies/equipment as designated in IFC and lab manuals	TBD	$0.00
AP Science courses require selected lab investigations as per ETS/College Board syllabi	Lab supplies/equipment as designated by College Board curriculum	TBD	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Biology E.O.C. online software program (remedial and enrichment)	USATestPrep.com online program	School based funding	$800.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Vertical teaming – incorporation of AP-based curricular concepts into introductory science courses	Upgraded curriculum maps with targeted areas indicating vertical teaming incorporation – topic based	School based funding	$1,000.00
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training)	District based/in-school based workshops	School based funding	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,800.00

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:	By June 2012, 85% (471) of tenth grade students will score 4.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (457)	85% (471)

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 writing “extended” and “layered” paragraphs instead of fully elaborated paragraphs.	Instruction and modeling of the use of Anchor papers; Student identification of “elaborated” paragraphs versus “layered” and “extended” paragraphs using student samples. Students revise “layered” and “extended” paragraphs to make them “elaborated.”	English Department Chair, Social Studies Department Chair, and Administration.	Collection and evaluation of Student Samples by grade-level teams with Department Chair bi-weekly. Student conferencing with teachers in order to decipher which students need additional assistance through the pull-out process. Student-to-student peer editing/conferencing.	Comparison of BAT Writing I samples with final “draft” that has gone through the revision process to improve elaboration to be submitted early October.
2	Using grade-level appropriate vocabulary.	Instruction/mini-lesson of “word choice.” Interactive Word Walls; flash cards to study word parts, including prefixes, roots, base words, and suffixes; revision of essays to replace lower-level vocabulary with more appropriate grade-level vocabulary	English Department Chair, Social Studies Department Chair, and Administration.	Collection and evaluation of Student Samples by grade-level teams with Department Chair on a bi-weekly basis. Student conferencing with teachers in order to decipher which students need additional assistance through the pull-out process. Student-to-student peer editing/conferencing.	Essay scores; District Essay assessments in September and November
3	Using effective transitional words and phrases to organize as per Six Traits model.	Instruction/mini-lesson of the use of Transitional words and phrases exercises, such as appropriate pairing of transitional words and phrases to a variety of organizational patterns in writing.	English Department Chair, Social Studies Department Chair, and Administration.	Collection and evaluation of Student Samples by grade-level teams with Department Chair on a bi-weekly basis. Student conferencing with teachers in order to decipher which students need additional assistance through the pull-out process. Student-to-student peer editing/conferencing.	Monthly Writing 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:	
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
English Common Planning and Lesson Study	9-12	Richard Wells (English Department Chair)	9th -12th English teachers (9 teachers)	Weekly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	Group Assessment Data Analysis; Weekly follow-up reports via email; One-on-One feedback sessions discussing data, student progress, teacher plans, IFC alignment, and strategy implementation; RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)
English and Core Teacher Teaming and Mentoring	9-10	Richard Wells (English Department Chair)	9th -10th Reading and English teachers (28 teachers)	Monthly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	Group Assessment Data Analysis; Monthly follow-up reports via email; Group feedback sessions discussing data, student progress, teacher plans, IFC alignment, and strategy implementation; RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)
					Weekly follow-up reports via email; Biweekly CWTs with follow-up teacher chats and action plans; Assessment Data Analysis; One-on-One	

Writing Best Practices	9-12	Richard Wells (English Department Chair)	9th -12th English teachers (9 teachers)	Weekly for 50 minutes Start Date: 8/16/12 End Date: 6/7/13	feedback sessions with teachers discussing strategies and data and planning for coaching support when needed; RtI; PD Survey quarterly for teachers to give feedback, suggestions and lessons learned	Richard Wells (English Department Chair); Christie Cerbone (Administrator)

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
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of Common Core/ FCAT curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	School Based Funding	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,000.00

End of 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:	By June 2013, 95% of our 11th grade students will take the field test for the EOC - U.S. History.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	EOC - U.S. History Field Test = Baseline Data Only
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	Student deficiencies in vocabulary, summarizing, note-taking,text structures, and memorization directly affect their ability to comprehend reading content in all academic areas	Teachers will receive professional development through modeling and demonstrating best practices. Explicit instruction of school-wide strategies (Chunking, Summarizing, Marginal Notes, Vocabulary Flash / Index cards, and Text Structures) in all content areas via Literacy Team, PSD, Eraly Release Days, and Department Meetings. School-wide emphasis on Common Core Standards and school-wide strategies will be incorporated. Every department creates and administers monthly instructional focus assessments and corresponding questions to improve reading in all content areas.	Assistant Principals Instructional Coaches Teachers	Evaluation of student work samples, Data Chat Review Sheets, Daily Lesson Plans and Agendas will be noted during classroom observations. Classroom observations procedures	Fair Testing Data BAT Mini Assessment Data USCPrep Test Software Data Pinnacle Gradebook Grades Student Folders / Portfolios

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:	By June 2013, 95% of our 11th grade students will take the field test for the EOC - U.S. History.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	EOC - U.S. History Field Test = Baseline Data Only

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
Best Practices for Differentiated Instruction	10-11	Department Chair	US and World History Teachers	Professional Study Days and Early Release Days	Class visits	Department Chairs Administration
Test Creation for EOC	10-11	Department Chair	US and World History Teachers	Pre-Planning in August	Class Visits, Teacher submissions	Department Chairs Administration
EOC Test Training information Sessions	11	Department Chair, test coordinator	US History Teachers	April	Survey/Questionnaire EOC Test	Department Chairs Administration
Teacher Training EOC Specs	11	AP Coach	US History Teachers	Professional Study Days and Early Release Days	Teacher Made Tests	Department Chairs, AP Coach, Administration

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
US History EOC students will be invited to participate in after school enrichment program	Instructional Materials	school-based funding	$2,000.00
US History EOC students will be invited to participate in after school enrichment program	Practice test, and sample	school-based funding	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $7,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Technology Training	PowerPoint Used	school-based funding	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/ FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	School-Based Funding	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives for EOC Student Achievement	Educational Materials/Events	school-based funding	$2,000.00
Incorporate current events and activities into daily curriculum	New York Times Online access	school funded	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $3,500.00
			Grand Total: $13,000.00

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:	By June 2011, non-attendance will decrease by 3%.

2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
90.6% yearly average	93.6% yearly average
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
1559 (62%)	1512 (60%)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
351 (14%)	340 (13%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Awareness and Availability	Parent links, guidance nights, grade level orientations, parent resource fair, letters home to parents, teacher phone contacts, parent conferences, and social worker referrals/agreements with parents and students	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, technology specialist, guidance counselors, and social workers	Non-Attendance List, PLASCO generated reports, and guidance counselor /student meetings	Parent Survey, PLASCO software, and Daily attendance Pinnacle report
2	Student Awareness	Assemblies, orientation, promotion of rewards programs for students, small-group conferencing and mentoring	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, and social workers	One-to-one conferences, large and small group assemblies, review of mini-assessment reports, state and district mandated attendance policies	Parent Survey, DMS/Teacher attendance referrals, and Daily attendance Pinnacle report TERMS Virtual Counselor
3	Student Motivation	Mentoring, Rewards for Success, wake-up calls, parent conferences, and “Bengal pep talks”	Attendance clerk, teachers, administrators, mentors/mentees, business partners, parent liaison, guidance counselors, and social workers	Weekly classroom visits. Review of grades through interims and report cards	School-wide incentive monitoring template, student surveys, and student interviews

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
Operational Attendance Procedures Training	School-wide	Administration	All staff members; including security	Monthly (60 minutes), on Early Release Days	Monitoring of attendance through Pinnacle/TERMS	Attendance Clerk, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Social Worker, and Administration
RTI Training/Operational Management and Documentation Procedures	School-wide	Administration	All staff members	Quarterly on an as needed basis for specific individuals	Teacher anecdotal	Attendance Clerk, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Social Worker, and Administration

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
Update US History textbooks for all teachers and students	New textbooks purchased	school funded	$120,000.00
			Subtotal: $120,000.00
			Grand Total: $120,000.00

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:	By June 2012, there will be a 5% decrease in suspension rate
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
826	784

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
438	416
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
229	218
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
179	170

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	Effective use of classroom disciplinary interventions	Better communication between teacher/student/parent interaction Following classroom/behavior management interventions (CHAMPS) Professional development workshops on using DMS	Teachers, Administration, and Guidance Counselors	Professional Development Workshops, referrals entered into DMS, Pinnacle and Virtual Counselor reports	Surveys, DMS data reports, Parent-Teacher meeting, and administrative/teacher chats
2	Contacting parents/guardians on a frequent basis	Parent Resource Center Change of address procedures and updates Emergency dismissal forms Individual Academic meetings with Parent, Student, Administrator, and Social Worker	Administration, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, and Social Worker	Surveys, Parent Notifications, Parent Conferences, Review of social worker interventions database	Parent-link reports, TERMS, Virtual Counselor, DMS reports, survey results, Social Worker's absence monitoring report
3	Alternatives to suspension	Suspension Reduction Program, AES, ESE Manifestation Meetings, PBIP/FBA strategies	Administration, ESE Specialists, and Guidance Counselors	Parent Conference/Contact Behavioral Success Plan Parent shadowing of their student	Registration/ Withdrawal Reports Informal feedback Parent Questionnaire Results Customer Survey 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
Leadership Team Training to align curriculum and teacher development	9-12	Principal	Leadership Team and Administration	1 full day per month	DMS reports/data collection and leadership team feedback, department meeting minutes, bi-weekly classroom walk through data	Administration
Security and Safety Procedural Training	9-12	Administration	Security Specialists, Monitors, and SRO	Weekly	Attendance/Discipline reports and data chats with Security Specialists (bi-weekly)	Administration
Behavior Management Training (supporting RtI and CHAMPS)	9-12	Administration	Teachers identified by leadership team	Monthly (60 minutes)	DMS reports/data collection and leadership team feedback, department meeting minutes, bi-weekly classroom walk through data and teacher-administration data chats (monthly)	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Suspension Reduction Program	Parent Conference, Alternative Probationary Contract, Monitoring Procedures, RtI		$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Website / Parent Links	Communication tools for parents		$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff Development Trainings	District Based Workshops		$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:	By June 2011, there will be a _____ decrease of the

**Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	dropout rate for all students.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
Total Rate = Pending White Rate = Pending Black Rate = Pending Hispanic Rate = Pending Asian Rate = Pending Multiracial Rate = Pending Female Rate = Pending Male Rate = Pending	Total Rate = _____ White Rate = _____ Black Rate = _____ Hispanic Rate = _____ Asian Rate = _____ Multiracial Rate = _____ Female Rate = _____ Male Rate = _____
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
_____	_____

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	Failure to pass core classes (Graduation Requirements)	Provide school-wide tutoring program and parent involvement training programs as well as the APEX course recovery program. Follow-up of seniors academic progress via administrator, parent, and student conferences NHS student mentoring for EOC/ACT/SAT test prep. (After-school tutoring)	Guidance counselors, Teachers, and Assistant principals	Student / parent Conferences, credit checks	Interim progress reports, report cards, Virtual Counselor Graduation Requirements Report
2	Non Attendance	Refer to social worker, attendance agreements, parent contact and conferences, and credit checks	Guidance counselors, Teachers, and Assistant principals	Teacher/Student/Parent Conferences	Pinnacle grade book, report cards, non-attendance/ excessive absences report
3	Distraction from school focus by outside influences.	Mentoring programs	Assistant Principals, Lead Teachers, Community/Parent Liaison	Surveys, reflections, documentation sheets	Post surveys, report cards

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.

				Target Dates		

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)	(e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Mentoring Training	9-12	Assistant Principals, Community/Parent Liaison	Lead Teachers	Monthly	Records and Logs of mentoring sessions, student mentee reflection sheets and surveys	Assistant Principals, Community Parent Liaison

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Training Academy	Awareness Materials/Periodicals		$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
Strategies for differentiated Instruction	Administrative training		$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.*	By June 2012, we will increase parent involvement by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
22%	25%
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	Parent participationin guidance nights	Parent/Student incentives were in place as initiatives Recruitment of community leaders/businesspartners Recruitment of feeder elementary and middle schools College Readiness Awareness	Administration,Technology Specialist, Guidance, and Community Liaison	Parent-links, website, flyers, sign-in sheets, and surveys	Survey Reports and Data Feedback
2	Parent participationin SAC/SAF	Parent/Student incentives were in place as initiatives Recruitment of community leaders/business partners Recruitment of feeder elementary and middle schools College Readiness Awareness	Administration, Technology Specialist, Guidance, and Community Liaison	Parent-links, website, flyers, sign-in sheets, and surveys	Survey Reports and Data Feedback
3	Parent participationin PTSA	Parent/Student incentives were in place as initiatives Recruitment of community leaders/business partners Recruitment of feeder elementary and middle schools College Readiness Awareness	Administration, Technology Specialist, Guidance, and Community Liaison	Parent-links, website, flyers, sign-in sheets, and surveys	Survey Reports and Data Feedback

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
Parent Communication Strategies Training	9-12	Administration, Guidance Counselors, Department Chairs	All Teachers	1 day during pre-planning week, 1 early release day per quarter	Parent contact logs recorded by teachers, Pinnacle reports with parent contact, bi-weekly updates in TERMS by Registrar	Administration, Guidance Director

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:	Initiate a STEM Program and expand the number of students who ultimately pursue advanced degrees and careers in STEM fields and broaden the participation of women and minorities in those fields.

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. Low student involvement in STEM clubs, events and organizations: SECME, Science Fair, Math & Science Competitions and few established STEM clubs/events implemented.	1.1. Recruit teachers in STEM related fields to create, organize, and facilitate STEM clubs, events, and organizations; advertise benefits of student participation in such events by school announcements, signage, and classroom visitations; Host in-house STEM competitions in which students can earn prizes.	1.1. Patricia Maynard & Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	1.1. Monitor enrollment and club activities including competitions on a monthly basis	1.1. Sign in sheets, minutes, student-teacher feedback
	1.2. Develop school-based STEM clubs, events and organizations, and promote enrolment from the under-represented	1.2. Recruit teachers in STEM related fields to brainstorm ideas, create, organize, and facilitate STEM clubs,	1.2. Patricia Maynard & Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch &	1.2. Identify and review by laws for SEMCE, Science Fair, Robotics Submit by laws and	1.2. Student-teachers feedback Enrollment comparisons

2	populations: SEMCE, Science Fair, Robotics	events, and organizations; work with district and/or other high schools to develop an implementation plan for STEM-related clubs, events, etc. that would benefit the school population.	Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	project proposal to school / district Implement and monitor schoolwide STEM related activities and projects	Surveys / Questionnaires
3	1.3. Limited funds to provide access to alternative STEM education—such as through museums, fieldtrips, after-school clubs or programs. Or guest speakers.	1.3. Work with partnerships coordinator and district STEM representatives and Grant personnel to find funds to host alternative STEM educational experiences for a targeted group of students in STEM-related classes.	1.3. Patricia Maynard & Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) & Patrick Lowe (Administrator)	.3. Identify and meet with business partners and district based Grant Writing Programs. District and city meetings for overview and goal setting Interdisciplinary meetings with Science, CTE, Math departments Create a timeline for success	1.3. District and city official feedback Student-teachers feedback Surveys / Questionnaires

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
What is STEM? (training)	9-12 Math &Science	Patricia Maynard / Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons)	9th -12th grade STEM subject related teachers (Math and Science departments)	Early Release Day in October	Teacher chats; appraisals;	Patricia Maynard & Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)
Effective STEM Practices	9-12 Math &Science	Patricia Maynard / Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons)	9th -12th grade STEM subject related teachers (Math and Science departments)	Early Release Days November-February	Data chats; appraisals; lesson plan review; lab planning/review; CWT's; review of student samples	Patricia Maynard / Jaclyn Stein (Math Department Chairpersons); Lorin Kawesch / Robert Pearson (Science Department Chairpersons) and Patrick Lowe (Administrator)

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:	By June of 2013, 400 students will have attained passing scores on various Industry Certifications

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. Incorporating test taking strategies and building test-taking awareness / climate for industry certification	1.1 Provide practice assessments with timed activities including immediate feedback. Conduct regular and ongoing student-teacher chats to discuss progress, challenges, goals, and test logistics. Remediation through teacher modeling; Plan and implement appropriate testing environment by including print rich rooms and word walls.	1.1. All CTE teachers, JoEllen Moneck, CTE Dept. Chair, Bobby Goodwin, Administrator	1.1 Biweekly CWTs that focus on the integrated strategies with teacher chats and action plans; Student sample collection and review; Bi-weekly student feedback and data chats.	1.1 Monthly practice tests on various aspects of each exam.

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Industry Exam Test Training information sessions	9-12	Department chair, test coordinator	CTE teachers, media specialist, lab instructors	Oct- May	Survey/questionnaire Practice Industry Exams	Department Chairs, Administration County Supervisors
Best Practices for Differentiated Instruction	9-12	Department chairs	CTE teachers	Monthly from September to February (department) 90 minutes	Ongoing data chats using teacher-completed departmental forms and data from Virtual Counselor for incoming students as it relates to differentiated instruction CWT to observe that differentiated instruction is taking place	Department Chairs, Administration
Training and workshops for CTE specific programs (TDIF)	9-12	Outside professionals for specific programs	CTE teachers	Sept-May	Report from workshop	Department Chair

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
Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	school funded	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,000.00

End of 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	Practice Sessions for Students – Online test preparation and assessment feedback / data reports	Florida Achieves Website florida-achieves.org	n/a	$0.00
CELLA	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/ FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's		$2,000.00
Mathematics	Practice Sessions for Students – Online test preparation and assessment feedback / data reports	BEEP Interactmath.com District-based practice test	District-based funding	$0.00
Mathematics	Preparation for EOC	EOC Practice Workbooks	School-based funding	$3,000.00
Science	Biology E.O.C. courses (Biology I & Biology Honors) require minimum essential lab investigations	Lab supplies/equipment as designated in IFC and lab manuals	TBD	$0.00
Science	AP Science courses require selected lab investigations as per ETS/College Board syllabi	Lab supplies/equipment as designated by College Board curriculum	TBD	$0.00
U.S. History	US History EOC students will be invited to participate in after school enrichment program	Instructional Materials	school-based funding	$2,000.00
U.S. History	US History EOC students will be invited to participate in after school enrichment program	Practice test, and sample	school-based funding	$5,000.00
Suspension	Suspension Reduction Program	Parent Conference, Alternative Probationary Contract, Monitoring Procedures, RtI		$0.00
Dropout Prevention	Parent Training Academy	Awareness Materials/Periodicals		$0.00
				Subtotal: $12,000.00

Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Fluency program Online software program (remedial & enrichment)	Reading Plus	School-funded	$3,000.00
Mathematics	Preparation for Geometry EOC	Scientific Calculators	School-based funding	$1,000.00
Science	Biology E.O.C. online software program (remedial and enrichment)	USATestPrep.com online program	School based funding	$800.00
U.S. History	Technology Training	PowerPoint Used	school-based funding	$500.00
Suspension	Website / Parent Links	Communication tools for parents		$0.00
				Subtotal: $5,300.00

Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and	District Workshops and in school team	School funded	$2,000.00

	benchmarking of EOC/FCAT/CTE curriculum	planning/PLC's		
Mathematics	Vertical teaming – incorporation of curricular concepts and instructional planning goals	Upgraded curriculum maps with targeted areas indicating vertical teaming incorporation – topic based	School based funding	$2,000.00
Mathematics	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and benchmarking of EOC / FCAT / CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning / PLC's	School based funding	$2,000.00
Science	Vertical teaming – incorporation of AP-based curricular concepts into introductory science courses	Upgraded curriculum maps with targeted areas indicating vertical teaming incorporation – topic based	School based funding	$1,000.00
Science	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training)	District based/in-school based workshops	School based funding	$1,000.00
Writing	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of Common Core/ FCAT curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	School Based Funding	$2,000.00
U.S. History	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training). District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/ FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	School-Based Funding	$2,000.00
Suspension	Staff Development Trainings	District Based Workshops		$0.00
Dropout Prevention	Strategies for differentiated Instruction	Administrative training		$0.00
CTE	Staff Development Training (inquiry-based training) District alignment and benchmarking of EOC/FCAT/CTE curriculum	District workshops and in school team planning/PLC's	school funded	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $14,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
U.S. History	Incentives for EOC Student Achievement	Educational Materials/Events	school-based funding	$2,000.00
U.S. History	Incorporate current events and activities into daily curriculum	New York Times Online access	school funded	$1,500.00
Attendance	Update US History textbooks for all teachers and students	New textbooks purchased	school funded	$120,000.00
				Subtotal: $123,500.00
				Grand Total: $154,800.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● NA

Are you a reward school: ● Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/22/2012)

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
-Instructional materials such as textbook and workbooks -Transportation costs for after school tutoring and athletics -Miscellaneous Materials: Copy paper, printer ink cartridges, auxilary instructional materials	$22,918.00

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

Activities for the SAC committee will include: Principal Updates, SIP curriculum reports from core department chairs, Bylaw Update procedures,SAF updates, District SAC Updates, Budget Updates, Introduction of proposals for school related items, and Community News and Updates

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

Broward School District
PIPER HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	36%	67%	82%	21%	206	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	45%	70%			115	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	44% (NO)	62% (YES)			106	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					427	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
PIPER HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	32%	69%	91%	26%	218	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	42%	75%			117	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	44% (NO)	67% (YES)			111	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					456	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested