FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PALM BEACH LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Anthony Hamlet

SAC Chair: Ludie Milhomme

Superintendent: Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		Degrees -B.S. – General Studies -M.S. – Educational Leadership -Ed.D. – Educational Leadership			Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Principal of JFK Middle Magnet School in 2010-2011 – Grade 'C'; 39% proficiency in reading; 79% meet criteria in writing; 62% of students made reading gains; 72% of lowest 25% made gains in reading; The subgroups Black, Economic Disadvantaged and Students with disabilities did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading. Writing AYP criteria was not met. Principal of JFK Middle Magnet School in 2009-2010 – Grade 'C'; 39% proficiency in reading; 41% proficiency in math; 93% meet criteria in writing; 25% proficiency in science; 55% of students made reading gains; 63% of students made math gains; 66% of lowest 25% made gains in reading;

Principal	Anthony Hamlet, Ed.D	Certifications -Educational Leadership -Sociology (6-12) Certifications -Educational Leadership -Sociology (6-12)	1	11	67% of lowest 25% made gains in math. The subgroups Black, Economic Disadvantaged and Students with disabilities did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Math or Reading. Writing AYP criteria was met. Principal of Turning Points Academy Alternative School in 2008-2009: Grade: Declining; Percent of students making a year's worth of progress in: Reading – 43%; Math – 66%; AYP: 74%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. % scoring 3 or above in writing – 69%; science – 11%. Principal of Turning Points Academy Alternative School in 2007-2008: Grade: I; Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading.
Assis Principal	Susan Gipson	Bachelor of Arts from the University of Florida; Master of Science and Doctoral Degree in Educational Administration from Hamilton University. Certification: Educational Leadership & Mathematics, State of Florida and ESOL endorsed	11	11	Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2010-2011: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 22%, Math Mastery: 54%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery 80%. AYP: 77% Total; Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2009-2010: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 21%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 30%, Writing Mastery 89%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 60%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery, 90%. AYP: 79%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Mathematics. 2006-2007: Grade D, Reading Mastery: 19%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery: 76%. AYP: 59%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2005-2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 17%, Math Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 78%. AYP: 67%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total, Black, ED, ELL and SWD did not Make AYP in Mathematics.
		Bachelor in Education,			Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2010-2011: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 22%, Math Mastery: 54%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery 80%. AYP: 77% Total; Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2009-2010: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 21%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 30%, Writing Mastery 89%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics.

Assis Principal	Robin Johnson	Florida State University; Masters Degree in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University. Certification: Educational Leadership, State of Florida and ESOL endorsed	10	10	2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 60%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery, 90%. AYP: 79%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Mathematics. 2006-2007: Grade D, Reading Mastery: 19%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery: 76%. AYP: 59%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2005-2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 17%, Math Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 78%. AYP: 67%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total, Black, ED, ELL and SWD did not Make AYP in Mathematics.
Assis Principal	Rosalind McCray	Bachelors in Speech, Language and Audiology Pathology, City College of New York; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership, Lynn University; enrolled in Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University. Certification: Educational Leadership, State of Florida and ESOL endorsed	8	8	Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2010-2011: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 22%, Math Mastery: 54%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery 80%. AYP: 77% Total; Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2009-2010: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 21%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 30%, Writing Mastery 89%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 60%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery, 90%. AYP: 79%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Mathematics. 2006-2007: Grade D, Reading Mastery: 19%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery: 76%. AYP: 59%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2005-2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 17%, Math Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 78%. AYP: 67%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total, Black, ED, ELL and SWD did not Make AYP in Mathematics.
Assis Principal	Joseph Holcombe	Bachelor of Science in Journalism, University of Florida; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership, Florida Atlantic University; Enrolled in Ph.D. program in Educational Leadership at Florida Atlantic	4	4	Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2010-2011: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 22%, Math Mastery: 54%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery 80%. AYP: 77% Total; Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2009-2010: School grade: C. Reading

		University (anticipated completion in 2014)

Certification: Language Arts (6-12) and Educational Leadership-State

of Florida and ESOL endorsed | | | Mastery: 21%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 30%, Writing Mastery 89%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics.

2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. |
| Assis Principal | Adrian Seepersaud | B.S. Biology M.E. Educational Leadership

Certification: Biology (6-12) Ed Leadership (all levels) | 1 | 3 | Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%.

Science Specialist with School District of Palm Beach County, 2008-2011: Science Proficiency Outcomes (%'s) John F. Kennedy Middle (SY 08/09) 10 to 25 (SY 9/10); 25 to 29 (SY 10/11); Bear Lakes Middle (SY 08/09) 21 to 26 (SY 9/10) 26 to 30 (SY 10/11); H.L. Watkins Middle (SY 09/10) 24 to 32 (SY 10/11) |
| Assis Principal | Brenda Cue Washington | B.S. Psychology M.S. Specific Learning Disabilities Ed.S. Educational Leadership

Certification: Psychology Sociology Exceptional Student Education Educational Leadership (all levels) Reading Endorsed | 1 | 19 | Assistant Principal of Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%.

Instructional Specialist: 4 years

Program Planner: 14 years |

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)
Mathematics	Vera Gibson-Willis	Bachelor of Science in Education, University of Tennessee; Master of Science in Mathematics Education, Nova Southeastern University.	10	7	Math Coach/Teacher at Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%.

2010-2011: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 22%, Math Mastery: 54%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery 80%. AYP: 77% Total; Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics.

2009-2010: School grade: C. Reading Mastery: 21%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 30%, Writing Mastery 89%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics.

2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 55%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 72%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics.

2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 23%, Math Mastery: 60%, Science |

Subject	Name	Degrees/Certifications			Performance Record
		Certification: Mathematics, State of Florida.			Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery, 90%. AYP: 79%, Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Mathematics. 2006-2007: Grade D, Reading Mastery: 19%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 26%, Writing Mastery: 76%. AYP: 59%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in either Reading or Mathematics. 2005-2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 17%, Math Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 78%. AYP: 67%. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. Total, Black, ED, ELL and SWD did not Make AYP in Mathematics.
Reading	Kendra Wester	Degrees: -B.S. Family and Child Sciences -M.S. Early Childhood Education Certifications: -ESOL Endorsement -Prek/Primary Education (age 3-Grade 3) -Reading Endorsement	1	4	Reading Coach at Palm Beach Lakes High School in 2011-2012: School grade: pending; Reading Mastery: 25%, Math Mastery: 40%, Writing Mastery 80%. Reading Coach of JFK Middle Magnet School in 2010-2011 – Grade 'C'; 39% proficiency in reading; 79% meet criteria in writing; 62% of students made reading gains; 72% of lowest 25% made gains in reading; The subgroups Black, Economic Disadvantaged and Students with disabilities did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading. Writing AYP criteria was not met. Reading Coach of JFK Middle Magnet School in 2009-2010 – Grade 'C'; 39% proficiency in reading; 93% meet criteria in writing; 55% of students made reading gains; 66% of lowest 25% made gains in reading; The subgroups Black, Economic Disadvantaged and Students with disabilities did not make Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading. Writing AYP criteria was met. Reading First Coach at Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary School in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 58%; Students scoring 3 or above in reading: 3rd grade – 53%; 4th grade – 70%; 5th grade – 51%. Writing: 4th grade – 97% 3.5 and above.
Science	Jon Breedlove	Degrees -B.S. – Biology -M.S. – Educational Technology Certifications: -Biology (6-12)	1	3	Science Specialist for Florida Department of Education, Bureau of School Improvement, Region V in 2010-11: Pleasant City Elementary School – Grade: A, Science Proficiency – 33%, an increase of 19% over the 14% from the previous year. West Riviera Elementary School – Grade: D, Science Proficiency – 32%, an increase of 4% from the 28% the previous year. Glades Central High School – Grade: B, Science Proficiency – 23%, an increase of 2% over the 21% from the previous year. Secondary Science Support for South Area, School District of Palm Beach County in 2009-10: Congress Middle School – Grade: A, Science Proficiency - 52%, an increase of 16% over the 36% from the previous year. Omni Middle School – Grade: A, Science Proficiency – 69%, and increase of 2% over the 67% from the previous year. Village Academy – Grade: C, Science Proficiency – 38%, and increase of 6% over the 32% from the previous year. Science Coach at Lake Worth Community High School in 2008-09: Grade: A, Science Proficiency – 39%, an increase of 8% over the 31% from the previous year.

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff as mentor teachers	Assistant Principal	On-going	
2	2. Regular meetings of new teachers with principal and monthly meetings with department instructional leaders	Principal	On-going	
3	3. Professional development opportunities to build teacher capacity	Principal & Designees	On-going	
4	4. Hire Highly Qualified teachers in core content areas.	Principal	As needed	

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
20 (17%)	Faculty and staff, where required, are being assisted in enrolling in endorsement/certification programs in order to bring their certificates into alignment with their assigned job duties. Faculty also participate in staff development sessions throughout the year in order to improve overall effectiveness as instructors.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
116	7.8%(9)	15.5%(18)	40.5%(47)	36.2%(42)	33.6%(39)	83.6%(97)	22.4%(26)	4.3%(5)	30.2%(35)

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
Tom Welter/Donna Pawlik, ACP	LaShanna Pearson-Roberts	Ms. Pearson-Roberts will teach science and Mr. Welter is an experienced science teacher and science department chair.	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly in a professional learning community to plan and implement lessons, discuss evidence of student learning, and work on the six FEAPs.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or credit recovery. Funds are also used for improved classroom practice and differentiation for students requiring remediation, professional development and family involvement. Students requiring remediation receive more differentiated classroom instruction focused on individual student needs through the use of Title I funds to employ an additional teacher in Reading, Mathematics, and Science. These additional teachers assure a smaller-group classroom environment, thus making differentiated instruction focused on individual student needs possible. Professional development focuses for the FY13 school year include use of differentiation strategies, reflective and data-driven instructional design, and higher-order and rigorous classroom activities to boost student achievement. Family involvement initiatives for the FY13 school year include strategies to involve parents in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school-wide program through the Title I parent meeting and regular School Advisory Committee meetings. Parents will also be encouraged to participate in decision making opportunities about their child's education through four parent university trainings, provision of materials related to higher-level courses (AP, Dual Enrollment, College Readiness), and regularly scheduled parent trainings on FCAT, financial aid, and college admissions.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs

Title II

The purpose of this funding is to increase student achievement through comprehensive district initiatives that focus on the preparation, training, recruitment, and retention of highly qualified educators. These funds will be used to address professional development needs within the content areas - with a specific focus on core content areas - in order to increase the use of differentiation strategies, reflective and data-driven instructional design, and higher-order and rigorous classroom activities to boost student achievement. In addition, the school will seek to hire highly-qualified teachers, with a specific focus on hiring highly-qualified teachers in core content areas.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. The Title III funds will be used to support tutorial services, additional teaching periods for home language/bilingual instruction in Reading and Math classes and for Community Language Facilitators to support the needs of ELL student and their families.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will not be received for FY13.

Violence Prevention Programs

Single-School Culture and Appreciation for Multicultural Diversity.
The school also offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates field trips, community service, drug testing, and counseling.

Nutrition Programs

The school provides free and reduced lunches to qualifying students.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

The School offers Adult Education classes through its after hours Community School.

Career and Technical Education

The school offers career-based choice programs in biotechnology, medical/nursing, teacher preparation, early-childhood education, and law. In addition, the school offers courses that prepare students for industry certification tests in the fields of technology and nursing.

Job Training

The school's OJT program provides students with a job skills program focusing on such topics as creation of a resume, dress for success, and performing well during a job interview. This program also allows students to earn high school credit by finding a job and demonstrating quality performance on that job.

Other

Required Instruction Listed in FL Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS leadership team is comprised of the following members: principal, assistant principal, ESE contact, ELL contact, school psychologist, classroom teacher, reading/math/science coaches, Learning Team Facilitator (LTF), and guidance staff.

The principal/Assistant Principal provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conduct assessments of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.

ESE and ELL contacts participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials into classroom instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching and/or language facilitation for students and parents. The ELL coordinator will monitor ELL progress on the ELDC and the ESE Coordinator will monitor student progress on IEPs recommending student interventions as indicated.

Instructional Coaches and Learning Team Facilitator develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs, identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, and identify patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies.

School Psychologist participates in the collection, interpretation and analysis of data and facilitates development of intervention plan. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities and data-based decision making activities.

Guidance Staff provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to interventions, guidance staff also link student/parents to necessary community resources.

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

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1- Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The SBT will use the Problem Solving Model* to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher or guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

* Problem Solving Model

The four steps of the Problem Solving Model are:

Problem Identification entails identifying the problem and the desired behavior for the student.

Problem Analysis involves analyzing why the problem is occurring by collecting data to determine possible causes of the identified problem.

Intervention Design & Implementation involves selecting or developing evidence-based interventions based upon data previously collected. These interventions are then implemented.

Evaluating is also termed MTSS. In this step, the effectiveness of a student's or group of students' response to the implemented intervention is evaluated and measured.

The problem solving process is self-correcting, and, if necessary, recycles in order to achieve the best outcomes for all students. This process is strongly supported by IDEA and the idea of all students achieving benchmarks regardless of their status in general or special education.

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?

Members of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team will meet collectively and then with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and will help develop the SY13 SIP. Utilizing the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets and focus attention on deficient areas will be discussed.

Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:

FCAT scores and the lowest 25%

Racial and socio-economic subgroups

Strengths and weaknesses of intensive programs

Mentoring, tutoring, and other services.

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.

Baseline data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Educational Data Warehouse (EDW)

Environmental Safety Report

Curriculum Based Measurement

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics

Palm Beach Writes

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

Office Discipline Referrals

Retentions

Absences

Midyear data:

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Educational Data Warehouse (EDW)

Environmental Safety Report

Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics

Palm Beach Writes

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

End of year data:

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Educational Data Warehouse (EDW)

Environmental Safety Report

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) and End-of-Course Exams (EOCs)

FCAT Writes

ACT/SAT/PERT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

MTSS leadership team members will provide in-service to the faculty on designated professional development days (PDD).
These in-service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:
Problem Solving Model
Consensus building
School Wide Positive Behavioral Support (SWPBS)
Data-based decision-making to drive instruction
Progress monitoring
Selection and availability of research-based interventions
Tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading.

Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers, as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Support for the MTSS process will need to be provided by all faculty and staff members on campus. It will be the job of faculty, administrators, and guidance counselors to identify students for recommendation to the school-based team when Tier 1 interventions are not adequately meeting student needs. Faculty and guidance counselors, in particular, will be integral in gathering the information necessary to allow the school-based team to design appropriate interventions for each child, and in developing the relationships with students that will allow for successful implementation of the interventions. Administration will be responsible for ensuring that all faculty and staff are appropriately trained on the operation of the MTSS process and their specific roles within that process. Administration will also be responsible for following up with faculty and staff members when steps in the MTSS process are not being followed to fidelity.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the reading coach, two students, the principal, the assistant principal supervising the reading department, the media specialist, and teachers representing all additional core content areas.

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

The Literacy Team meets once a month to create capacity and build reading knowledge within the school and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. Administration, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees serve on the team.
Administration completes weekly classroom walkthroughs towards progress monitoring and – with the assistance of the LLT as a whole – develops a course of action, implements the action, analyzes its effectiveness, and reflects on the process. This is continuous process throughout the entire school year.

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

School wide literacy plan to include: classroom libraries, implementation of the Reading Counts program, teacher collaboration across the content areas using common focus calendars, professional development to build teacher capacity in several school-wide literacy and writing strategies, use of common planning and small learning teams to promote best practices to increase student literacy, display of student work for promoting positive school climate, and continued implementation of a rotational model of instruction in Reading classes and small group instructional practice in other content areas to ensure quality instruction targeted to student needs.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/21/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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.

1.All teachers will routinely incorporate reading and writing strategies emphasized during professional development and designed to enhance literacy and learning. Reading strategies for content area teachers (social studies, science, electives, etc.) will be determined by the reading coach via the reading department instructional focus calendar. Writing strategies for content area teachers should adhere to the English department's writing plan and paragraph writing model. Support for this implementation will be provided through regular learning team meetings.
2.All students will learn and routinely use reading and writing support strategies to enhance literacy and learning across all content areas.
3.All members of the school community will embrace the idea that all students can succeed academically and will provide opportunities to help students meet high expectations.
4.Student work will be prominently displayed in classrooms, hallways and common areas to showcase students' progress and achievement relating literacy to content area learning as a message that our students are valued and celebrated.
5.Our school will offer a continuum of research-based literacy interventions, including use of EDGE in reading classrooms and the Springboard curriculum in English classrooms, for struggling students aligned with student needs and implemented with fidelity.
6.Professional learning opportunities will be offered to faculty to assure implementation of plan. Topics such as differentiated instruction and scaffolding to higher-order questions are considered high-priority and will be addressed early in the professional development calendar.
7.Teachers of students who are assessed through the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) will utilize Reading strategies applicable to each student's IEP goals.

*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?

The school offers students elective courses in business, technology, and construction, and choice programs in law, teacher education, early childhood, biotechnology and medicine/nursing. These courses and programs focus on job skills, offer students internships, and offer students the opportunity to earn industry certification and college credits. We continue to discuss "soft skills" important to success in the workforce via daily Teacher Advisory sessions.

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?

Academic and career planning begins in the 9th grade. All students review their academic progress twice per year with a counselor via presentations in the classroom. Grade level assemblies are held to review and assist with course selections every year. Parents are encouraged to discuss course selections with students.
We use our college bound coaches to meet with students and disseminate information about colleges and careers in along with the school guidance counselors. We offer several career academies including Teacher Academy, Pre-Law Academy, Early Childhood, Bio-Tech, and the Medical Academy that give students practical knowledge and experience. We offer Industry Certification in our business education and select magnet programs.
Students are also exposed to wide variety of presenters and workshops during and after school. Career planning materials are available in the media center as well as the guidance department to allow students the opportunity for continued research and 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

Palm Beach Lakes High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum, enrolled in Algebra I course before 9th grade, completed at least one level 3 high school math course and completed a Dual Enrollment math course were all below the district and state averages, but Palm Beach Lakes High School is committed to creating a greater emphasis on postsecondary readiness. We will also encourage students to take AP or Dual Enrollment classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor and/or the graduation coach regarding their postsecondary plans. Students will also be selected to take the AVID class as an elective. Parent information meetings will be held. This will include sharing information and requirements to become eligible for Bright Futures. During common planning, teachers will review charts tracking graduation requirements and Bright Futures requirements and intervene as necessary. SWD will have a summary of performance evaluation as well as an AIEP for transition purposes to referrals to appropriate outside agencies. Eleventh grade students in the college readiness cohort will take the state-subsidized PERT test to determine college readiness. Those students who fail to score college-ready on the PERT will be assigned to English IV for College Readiness and Math for College Readiness, courses specifically designed to remediate student's readiness deficiencies. These students will be given the PERT again during the second semester of their senior year in order to gauge progress toward college readiness.

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 16% (109) of the students scored level 3 or higher. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 41% will demonstrate proficiency by scoring level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (109) at level 3 or higher.	41% at level 3 or higher

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.Lack of instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	1A.1. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	1A.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1A.1. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	1A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data
2	1A.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1A.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	1A.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1A.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1A.3. Lack of appropriate level of instructional rigor to ensure students achieve mastery of complex reading skills	1A.3. Teachers will receive training and instructional coach support in order to utilize common planning to create lesson plans that include higher order questioning and rigorous instructional tasks for students.	1A.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1A.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1A.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FAA Reading, 38% (9) of the students scored levels 4-6. On the 2013 FAA Reading, 45% will score levels 4-6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (9) at levels 4-6.	45% at levels 4-6.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1B.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1B.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	1B.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1B.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1B.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	1B.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	1B.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1B.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	1B.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	1B.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1B.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 8% (56) of the students scored level 4 or higher. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 20% will score level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (56) at level 4 or higher	20% at level 4 or higher

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1.Lack of instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	2A.1. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	2A.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2A.1. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	2A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data
2	2A.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	2A.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of	2A.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2A.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

3	2A.3. Lack of appropriate level of instructional rigor to ensure students achieve mastery of complex reading skills	2A.3. Teachers will receive training and instructional coach support in order to utilize common planning to create lesson plans that include higher order questioning and rigorous instructional tasks for students.	2A.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2A.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2A.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FAA Reading, 33% (8) of the students scored at or above a level 7. On the 2013 FAA Reading, 40% will score at or above a level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (8) at or above a level 7	40% at or above a level 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	2B.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	2b.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	2B.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2B.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2B.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	2B.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	2B.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	2B.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2B.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	2B.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	2B.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	2B.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2B.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2B.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 53% (186) of the students made learning gains. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 60% will make learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

53% (186) made learning gains			60% will make learning gains		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1.Lack of instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	3A.1. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	3A.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3A.1. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	3A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data
2	3A.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	3A.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	3A.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3A.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	3A.3. Lack of appropriate level of instructional rigor to ensure students achieve mastery of complex reading skills	3A.3. Teachers will receive training and instructional coach support in order to utilize common planning to create lesson plans that include higher order questioning and rigorous instructional tasks for students.	3A.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3A.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3A.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FAA Reading, 33% (8) of the students made learning gains. On the 2013 FAA Reading, 40% will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (8) made learning gains	40% will make learning gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	3B.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	3B.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3B.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3B.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
	3B.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	3B.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and	3B.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant	3B.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

			Principals responsible for each content area		
2		common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.			
3	3B.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	3B.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	3B.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3B.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3B.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 69% of the low 25% students made learning gains. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 75% will make learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% made learning gains	75% will make learning gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1.Lack of instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	4A.1. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	4A.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	4A.1. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	4A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data
2	4A.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	4A.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	4A.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	4A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	4A.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	4A.3. Lack of appropriate level of instructional rigor to ensure students achieve mastery of complex reading skills	4A.3. Teachers will receive training and instructional coach support in order to utilize common planning to create lesson plans that include higher order questioning and rigorous instructional tasks for students.	4A.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	4A.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	4A.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | 5A : | In accordance with the goal of reducing the achievement gap in reading by 50% in six years, the school will show incremental increases in reading performance as described below. |

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	35%	41%	47%	53%	59%	

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, the following subgroups did not meet their AMO targets: White, Black and Hispanic. All subgroups will meet the 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 60% Black: 77% Hispanic: 72% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 43% Black: 62% Hispanic: 51% Asian: N/A 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	5B.1.Lack of instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	5B.1. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	5B.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	5B.1. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	5B.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data
2	5B.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	5B.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	5B.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	5B.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	5B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	5B.3. Lack of appropriate level of instructional rigor to ensure students achieve mastery of complex reading skills	5B.3. Teachers will receive training and instructional coach support in order to utilize common planning to create lesson plans that include higher order questioning and rigorous instructional tasks for students.	5B.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	5B.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	5B.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 6% (3) of ELL students were proficient. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 23% will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	6% (3) of ELL students were proficient		23% of ELL students will be proficient		

	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	5C.1. Lack of appropriate reading materials to match individual ELL students' language and lexile levels.	5C.1. Implement the Web-based Differentiated Instruction Literacy Program specifically designed for English language learners allowing student access to an extensive database of individually lexiled texts through ESOL reading classes and beyond the classroom setting from any internet-enabled device.	5C.1. ESOL Coordinator Reading Coach	5C.1. On-going student progress monitoring via program-generated individual and group student progress reports, student assessment data, classroom workthroughs	5C.1. Student Assessment Data, Classroom Look-Fors Checklist
2	5C.2. Lack of teacher pre- and post-reading support and scaffolding to deepen comprehension	5C.2. The teachers will receive Professional Development Training and implement strategies on facilitating pre- and post-reading discussion	5C.2. ESOL Coordinator Reading Coach	5C.2. Classroom observations, student assessment data	5C.2. Classroom Look-For Checklist, students assessment data
3	5C.3. Lack of post-reading writing component to allow student negotiate and construct meaning from texts, as well express their ideas to promote critical literacy skills.	5C.3. The teachers will receive Professional development and implement strategies on story-related writing	5C.3. ESOL Coordinator Reading Coach	5C.3. Classroom observations, Student progress reports	5C.3. Program-generated Student Progress Reports, Student assessment 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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 11% (12) of SWD students were proficient. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 32% will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (12) of SWD students were proficient	32% of SWD students will be proficient

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	5D.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	5D.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	5D.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	5D.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
	5D.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	5D.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop	5D.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals	5D.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	5D.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

2		ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	responsible for each content area		
3	5D.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	5D.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	5D.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	5D.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	5D.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 26% (151) of ED students were proficient. On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 39% will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (151) of ED students were proficient	39% of ED students will be proficient

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Teachers face challenge of utilizing data for differentiated instruction and best practices	5E.1. Reading teachers will utilize the Rotational Instructional Model, Edge and Reading plus in the Intensive Reading classes	5E.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and District Facilitator	5E.1. The Reading Coach will monitor the implementation by doing classroom walkthroughs	5E.1. PMRN and walkthrough log.
2	5E.2. Lack of School-wide Reading Instructional Focus	5E.2. Implementation of Instructional Focus Calendar across the curriculum using reading benchmarks	5E.2. Principal , AP's assigned to monitor various departments Reading Coach	5E.2. Review of Diagnostic, FAIR, and school-based Assessments Review lesson plans for differentiated instruction Walk-throughs	5E.2. Diagnostic, FAIR, school-based assessment data Review of lesson plans Walk-through log
3	5E.3. Inconsistent use of Direct Explicit Instruction	5E.3. Professional Development and monitoring of Direct Explicit Instruction with gradual release (I do, we do, you do) Use of Edge in 90 minute + Reading classes	5E.3. Principal , AP assigned to monitor Reading, AP assigned to English, Reading Coach, Reading Specialist	5E.3. Review lesson plans for differentiated instruction Walk-throughs	5E.3. Review of lesson plans Walk-through log

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Higher Order Questioning	All	Both	School-wide	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Data-Driven Instruction	All	Both	School-wide	September 2012	LTM Meetings/Data Chats/Monitoring of Teachers' Data Binders	Administration
Gradual Release Model	All	Both	School-wide	August 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutors	Title I	$12,500.00
Classroom Instructional Materials	Paper, toner, printer cartridges, pens, markers, charts, journals, classroom libraries, etc.	Title I	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $16,500.00
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
Reading Coach/LTF	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), registrations (IRA, ASCD, NABSE, High School Principal's Conference)	Title I	$10,000.00
			Subtotal: $77,588.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $94,088.00

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:	On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 31% (69) of the students scored proficient in listening/speaking. On the 2013 CELLA assessment, 35% will score proficient in listening/speaking.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 31% (69) of the students scored proficient in listening/speaking.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of oral/listening skills developmental strategies during classroom instruction	1.1.Provide professional development and model strategies for teachers to implement to develop ELL student oral and listening English language skills.	1.1. ESOL Coordinator Reading Coach	1.1Classroom observations	1.1.Student Assessment Data, Classroom Look-Fors Checklist
2	1.2. Lack of Second language Vocabulary	1.2 Provide professional development and model strategies for teachers to foster vocabulary acquisition	1.2.ESOL Coordinator	1.2. Classroom observations	1.2. Classroom Look-For Checklist
3	1.3. Lack of oral/listening skills developmental strategies during classroom instruction	1.3 Provide District Professional Development Training on Oral language development strategies to be used by teachers in ELL classrooms	1.3ESOL Coordinator	1.3 Classroom observations	1.3 Classroom Look-For Checklist

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:	On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 15% (32) of the students scored proficient in reading. On the 2013 CELLA assessment, 25% will score proficient in reading.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 15% (32) of the students scored proficient in reading.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of differentiated instruction to develop ELL student reading skills.	2.1. Provide professional development and model strategies for teachers to implement to increase second language comprehension..	2.1. ESOL Coordinator Reading Coach	2.1. Classroom walkthoughs	2.1. Classroom Look-For Checklist
2	2.2. Lack of Student engagement and motivation	2.2. Provide incentives for students to set reading goals and complete a minimum of 2 reading sessions per week	2.2. ESOL Coordinator	2.2. Student progress reports	2.2.Student assessment data
3	2.3. Lack of time devoted to practice reading	2.3. Designate time during ESOL reading class and afterschool tutorials for practice reading and use of the online literacy program	2.3.ESOL Coordinator	2.3. Student progress reports	2.3. Program-generated student progress reports Student assessment 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:	On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 14% (30) of the students scored proficient in writing. On the 2013 CELLA assessment, 25% will score proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

On the 2012 CELLA assessment, 14% (30) of the students scored proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of designated time for writing	2.1. The teachers will receive Professional development and implement strategies on story-related writing	2.1.ESOL Coordinator	2.1. Student Progress Reports	2.1. Student assessment data
2	2.2. Lack of Grammar and punctuation instruction	2.2. Infusion of English Grammar and Punctuation instruction via ESOL Writing Pull-Out tutorial and English classes.	2.2. ESOL Coordinator District ESOL Writing Coach English ESOLTeachers	2.2. Classroom walktroughs Student assessment data	2.2.Student assessment data

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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:	On the 2012 FAA Mathematics, 39% (9) of the students scored levels 4-6. On the 2013 FAA Mathematics, 50% will score levels 4-6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA Mathematics, 39% (9) of the students scored levels 4-6.	On the 2013 FAA Mathematics, 50% will score levels 4-6.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	1.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	1.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	1.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	1.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student math-relatied vocabulary and exposure to daily activities related to math concepts, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	1.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	2.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	2.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	2.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	2.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	2.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	2.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	2.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student math-relatied vocabulary and exposure to daily activities related to math concepts, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	2.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FAA Mathematics, 43% (10) of the students made learning gains. On the 2013 FAA Mathematics, 50% will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA Mathematics, 43% (10) of the students made learning gains.	On the 2013 FAA Mathematics, 50% will make learning gains.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	3.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take	3.1. Teachers will receive training,	3.1. Instructional Coaches,	3.1. Lesson plan review and classroom	3.1. Lesson plans and classroom

1	ownership of the material they are expected to master	observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	walkthroughs	walkthrough logs
2	3.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	3.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	3.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	3.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	3.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student math-relatied vocabulary and exposure to daily activities related to math concepts, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	3.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	3.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	3.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC __% (___) of white students, ___% (___) of black students, ___% (___) of Hispanic Students, ___% (___) of Asian students, and ___% (__) of American Indian students were proficient. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, ___% of white students, ___% of black students, ___% of Hispanic students, ____% of Asian students, and ___% of American Indian students will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: ___% (__) Black: ___% (___) Hispanic: __% (__) Asian: 100% (__) American Indian: ___% (___)	White: ___% Black: ___% Hispanic: __% Asian: 100% American Indian: 100%
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	3B.1. Lack of unified instructional strategies across classrooms	3B.1. Teachers will attend trainings on AVID and Gradual Release instructional strategies so that they may use common planning time to develop lessons that utilize AVID and Gradual Release strategies.	3B.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	3B.1. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	3B.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	3B.2. Lack of student accountable talk in the classroom	3B.2. Teachers will attend trainings on accountable talk in order to design lesson plans that incorporate question and response stems designed to facilitate accountable talk.	3B.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	3B.2. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	3B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	3B.3. Lack of opportunity for students to apply critical thinking skills in the classroom	3B.3. Teachers will attend trainings on critical thinking in order to design lessons that model critical thinking skills and allow students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking activities with teacher guidance.	3B.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	3B.3. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	3B.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 18% (11) English Language Learners were proficient. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 30% of English Language Learners will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 18% (11) English Language Learners were proficient.	On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 30% of English Language Learners will be proficient.

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	3C.1. Lack of native language support in class	3C.1.Assigning Language Community Facilitators to remove language barrier.	3C.1.ESOL Coordinator	3C.1.Classroom observations, Student assessment data	3C.1. Classroom walkthroughs
2	3C.2. Lack of instructional materials	3C.2. Purchasing graphic calculators	3C.2.ESOL Coordinator	3C.2.Student assessment data	3C.2.Student assessment data
3	3C.3. Lack of student content-related vocabulary	3C.3.Using native language picture dictionaries, visuals	3C.3. ESOL Coordinator	3C.3.Classrooms observations	3C.3.Student assessment 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 11% (7) Students with Disabilities were proficient. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 25% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 11% (7) Students with Disabilities were proficient.		On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 25% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient.		

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	3D.1. Teachers needing to address students various learning styles	3D.1. Infuse technology Into classrooms -Gizmos, Interwrite Tablets, labtops, vodcast/podcast, calculators	3D.1. Administrative Team, Supervising AP Instructional Leader, Team Leader, and Math Coach	3D.1. Formative and Summative Assessment Results Common Planning Meetings	3D.1. Progress of students on assessment, lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.
2	3D.2. Students possessing varied readiness levels	3D.2. Teachers will scaffold and differentiate instruction in order to meet individual student needs.	3D.2. Administrative Team, Supervising AP Instructional Leader, Team Leader, and Math Coach	3D.2. Formative and Summative Assessment Results Common Planning Meetings	3D.2. Progress of students on assessment, lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.
3	3D.3. Students comprehending word problems	3D.3. Incorporate problem solving/AVID strategies.	3D.3. Administrative Team, Supervising AP Instructional Leader, Team Leader, AVID Math teachers, and Math Coach	3D.3. Word Problems included on assessments	3D.3. Progress of students on assessment, lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 29% (106) Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 45% of Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 29% (106) Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient.	On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 45% of Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient.

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	3E.1. Lack of instructional time in class to meet areas of weakness/prior knowledge gaps.	3E.1. After-school tutorials and Saturday Tutorials	3E.1. Administrative Team, Instructional Leader, and Math Coach	3E.1. Formative and Summative Assessment Results	3E.1. Attendance Sheets Assessment Reports
2	3E.2. Teachers needing to address students various learning styles	3E.2. Infuse technology Into classrooms -Gizmos, Interwrite Tablets, labtops, vodcast/podcast,	3E.2. Administrative Team, Supervising AP Instructional	3E.2. Formative and Summative Assessment Results Common Planning	3E.2. Progress of students on assessment, lesson plans and classroom walk-

		calculators	Leader, Team Leader, and Math Coach	Meetings	throughs.
3	3E.3. Students possessing varied readiness levels	3E.3. Teachers will scaffold and differentiate instruction in order to meet individual student needs.	3E.3. Administrative Team, Supervising AP Instructional Leader, Team Leader, and Math Coach	3E.3. Formative and Summative Assessment Results Common Planning Meetings	3E.3. Progress of students on assessment, lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.

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:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 25% (120) of students were proficient. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 45% will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 25% (120) of students were proficient.	On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 45% will be proficient.

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. Lack of unified instructional strategies across classrooms	1.1. Teachers will attend trainings on AVID and Gradual Release instructional strategies so that they may use common planning time to develop lessons that utilize AVID and Gradual Release strategies.	1.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.1. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1.2. Lack of student accountable talk in the classroom	1.2. Teachers will attend trainings on accountable talk in order to design lesson plans that incorporate question and response stems designed to facilitate accountable talk.	1.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.2. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1.3. Lack of opportunity for students to apply critical thinking skills in the classroom	1.3. Teachers will attend trainings on critical thinking in order to design lessons that model critical thinking skills and allow students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking activities with teacher guidance.	1.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.3. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 3% (14) of students scored a 4 or above. On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 10% will score a 4 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Algebra I EOC, 3% (14) of students scored a 4 or above.	On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, 10% will score a 4 or above.

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. Lack of unified instructional strategies across classrooms	2.1. Teachers will attend trainings on AVID and Gradual Release instructional strategies so that they may use common planning time to develop lessons that utilize AVID and Gradual Release strategies.	2.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.1. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	2.2. Lack of student accountable talk in the classroom	2.2. Teachers will attend trainings on accountable talk in order to design lesson plans that incorporate question and response stems designed to facilitate accountable talk.	2.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.2. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	2.3. Lack of opportunity for students to apply critical thinking skills in the classroom	2.3. Teachers will attend trainings on critical thinking in order to design lessons that model critical thinking skills and allow students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking activities with teacher guidance.	2.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.3. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	The Geometry EOC was field tested in 2012. On the 2013 Geometry EOC, 40% of students will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The Geometry EOC was field tested in 2012.	On the 2013 Geometry EOC, 40% of students will be proficient.

	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. Lack of unified instructional strategies across classrooms	1.1. Teachers will attend trainings on AVID and Gradual Release instructional strategies so that they may use common planning time to develop lessons that utilize AVID and Gradual Release strategies.	1.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.1. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1.2. Lack of student accountable talk in the classroom	1.2. Teachers will attend trainings on accountable talk in order to design lesson plans that incorporate question and response stems designed to facilitate accountable talk.	1.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.2. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1.3. Lack of opportunity for students to apply critical thinking skills in the classroom	1.3. Teachers will attend trainings on critical thinking in order to design lessons that model critical thinking skills and allow students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking activities with teacher guidance.	1.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	1.3. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The Geometry EOC was field tested in 2012. On the 2013 Geometry EOC, 10% of students will score a 4 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The Geometry EOC was field tested in 2012.	On the 2013 Geometry EOC, 10% of students will score a 4 or better.

	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. Lack of unified instructional strategies across classrooms	2.1. Teachers will attend trainings on AVID and Gradual Release instructional strategies so that they may use common planning time to develop lessons that utilize AVID and Gradual Release strategies.	2.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.1. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	2.2. Lack of student accountable talk in the classroom	2.2. Teachers will attend trainings on accountable talk in order to design lesson plans that incorporate	2.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.2. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

	question and response stems designed to facilitate accountable talk.			
3	2.3. Lack of opportunity for students to apply critical thinking skills in the classroom	2.3. Teachers will attend trainings on critical thinking in order to design lessons that model critical thinking skills and allow students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking activities with teacher guidance.	2.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over the math department	2.3. Lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs	2.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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
AVID/Gradual Release Strategies	All	Both	School-Wide	August 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Teaching Critical Thinking	Math (9-12)	Both	Math Department	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Accountable Talk	Math (9-12)	Both	Math Department	September 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutors	Title I	$6,250.00
On-Line/Computer-Based Instructional Programs	Computer hardware	Title I	$2,100.00
Instructional Materials	Supplies (toner, paper, pens, markers, charts, calculators, manipulatives, clickers)	Title I	$10,000.00
On-Line/Computer-Based Instructional Programs	Lap-top computers and mobile charging cart	Title I	$22,900.00
			Subtotal: $41,250.00
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
Math Coach	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), registrations (AP Conferences, NCTM, NSDC, High School Principal's Conference)	Title I	$6,000.00
			Subtotal: $73,588.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $114,838.00

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:	On the 2012 FAA Science, 50% (5) of the students scored levels 4-6. On the 2013 FAA Science, 60% will score levels 4-6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA Science, 50% (5) of the students scored levels 4-6.	On the 2013 FAA Science, 60% will score levels 4-6.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	1.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	1.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	1.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	1.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary related to scientific concepts and information, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	1.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

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:	On the 2012 FAA Science, 30% (3) of the students scored a level 7 or above. On the 2013 FAA Science, 40% will score levels 4-6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA Science, 30% (3) of the students scored a level 7 or above.	On the 2013 FAA Science, 40% will score levels 4-6.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	2.1. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop lesson plans to utilize the Gradual Release Model of instruction.	2.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	2.2. Curriculum pacing not aligned with learning capabilities of students.	2.2. Teachers will receive training, observe model lessons, and common plan to develop ability to chunk lessons into manageable segments, repeat material to boost student retention, and scaffold material for student retention.	2.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	2.3. Lack of exposure to higher-level vocabulary related to real-world situations.	2.3. Teachers will utilize a print-rich environment, community-based instruction, and field trips to boost student vocabulary related to scientific concepts and information, and address cognitive deficits through teaching to all modalities.	2.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	2.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	2.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	The Biology I EOC was field tested in 2012. On the 2013 Biology I EOC, 40% of students will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | | The Biology I EOC was field tested in 2012. | | On the 2013 Biology I EOC, 40% of students will be proficient. | |

		The Biology I EOC was field tested in 2012.		On the 2013 Biology I EOC, 40% of students will be proficient.	

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. Lack of student engagement and rigor in classroom instruction	1.1. Teachers will review test item specifications, content standards, and curriculum materials during common planning times in order to develop lesson plans that include higher-order questioning and activities at a moderate to high cognitive complexity level.	1.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.
2	1.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1.2. Teachers will participate in trainings on 5E and the gradual release model of instruction in order to plan lessons and display board configurations that reflect the use of these instructional strategies.	1.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.
3	1.3. Lack of inquiry-based learning activities in the classroom	1.3. Teachers will implement lab activities, including higher-order questioning, as a regular part of classroom instruction.	1.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	The Biology I EOC was field tested in 2012. On the 2013 Biology I EOC, 10% of students will score a 4 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The Biology I EOC was field tested in 2012.	On the 2013 Biology I EOC, 10% of students will score a 4 or better.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1. Lack of student engagement and rigor in classroom instruction	2.1. Teachers will review test item specifications, content standards, and curriculum materials during common	2.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	2.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	2.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.

1		planning times in order to develop lesson plans that include higher-order questioning and activities at a moderate to high cognitive complexity level.			
2	2.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	2.2. Teachers will participate in trainings on 5E and the gradual release model of instruction in order to plan lessons and display board configurations that reflect the use of these instructional strategies.	2.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	2.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	2.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.
3	2.3. Lack of inquiry-based learning activities in the classroom	2.3. Teachers will implement lab activities, including higher-order questioning, as a regular part of classroom instruction.	2.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	2.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	2.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.

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
5E/Gradual Release Strategies	Science (9-12)	Both	Science Department	September 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Test Item Specifications	Biology	Both	Biology Teachers	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Higher Order Questioning	All	Both	School-wide	November 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring	Stipend for part-time tutors	Title I	$6,250.00
Instructional Materials	Classroom supplies, lab materials, paper, toner, consumable lab supplies, pens	Title I	$3,500.00
			Subtotal: $9,750.00
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
Science Coach	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), conference registrations (AP conferences, NCTM, NSDC, High School Principals Conference)	Title I	$6,000.00
			Subtotal: $73,588.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $83,338.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	On the 2012 FCAT Writes, 83% (276) of students scored a 3 or better. On the 2013 FCAT Writes, 85% of students will score a 3 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Writes, 83% (276) of students scored a 3 or better.	On the 2013 FCAT Writes, 85% of students will score a 3 or better.

	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. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1A.1. Teachers will participate in training on the Gradual Release Model in order to use common planning time to plan writing lessons that incorporate this instructional strategy.	1A.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1A.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1A.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1A.2. Lack of opportunity for the students to engage in the full writing process	1A.2. Teachers will develop and follow instructional focus calendars that include opportunities for students to write in response to literature, and opportunities for students to revise and publish their writing based on specific feedback from the teacher.	1A.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1A.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1A.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
	1A.3. Lack of writing instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	1A.3. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and	1A.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant	1A.3. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	1A.3. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment data

		plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	Principals responsible for each content area		
3					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	On the 2012 FCAT Writes, 41% (136) of students scored a 4 or better. On the 2013 FCAT Writes, 70% of students will score a 4 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Writes, 41% (136) of students scored a 4 or better.	On the 2013 FCAT Writes, 70% of students will score a 4 or better.

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. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1B.1. Teachers will participate in training on the Gradual Release Model in order to use common planning time to plan writing lessons that incorporate this instructional strategy.	1B.1. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1B.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
2	1B.2. Lack of opportunity for the students to engage in the full writing process	1B.2. Teachers will develop and follow instructional focus calendars that include opportunities for students to write in response to literature, and opportunities for students to revise and publish their writing based on specific feedback from the teacher.	1B.2. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs	1B.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs
3	1B.3. Lack of writing instruction tailored to students' specific learning needs	1B.3. Teachers will continuously use formal and informal assessment data to select materials and plan instruction for students as a whole group and in small groups in order to ensure individual student needs are met.	1B.3. Instructional Coaches, Principal, and Assistant Principals responsible for each content area	1B.3. Lesson plan review, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring of student assessment data	1B.3. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough logs, and assessment 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
Gradual Release Model	All	Both	School-wide	August 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
FCAT Writes Scoring	English/SS (9-10)	Both	English and Social Studies Teachers	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Data-Driven Instruction	All	Both	School-wide	September 2012	LTM Meetings/Data Chats/Monitoring of Teachers' Data Binders	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutoring	Title I	$3,375.00
Instructional Materials	Supplies, journals, charts, paper, markers, toner	Title I	$1,484.00
			Subtotal: $4,859.00
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
Professional Development Conferences	In-county workshops, College Board/AP workshops, Writing conferences)	Title I	$2,125.00
			Subtotal: $2,125.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $6,984.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The 2012 attendance rate was 83%. For 2013, the expected attendance rate is 90%, and the number of students with excessive absences and tardies will be reduced.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The 2012 attendance rate was 83%.	For 2013, the expected attendance rate is 90%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2012, there were 349 students with 10 or more absences.	In 2013, there will be fewer than 200 students with 10 or more absences.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 2012, there were 608 students with 10 or more tardies.	In 2013, there will be fewer than 300 students with 10 or more tardies.

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. Lack of uniform understanding and enforcement of attendance policies	1.1. Leadership team will develop and provide professional development to all faculty and staff regarding the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) plan and the specifics of the student attendance policies and	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1.Tracking of attendancetardiness rates among students	1.1. Student attendance and tardiness rates

		enforcement procedures contained within said plan.			
2	1.2. Students have low motivation to attend class on time.	1.2. Implement incentives as part of SWPBS program to encourage punctuality to class.	1.2. Principal, assistant Principals, and Teachers	1.2. Monitoring of student tardiness through GradeQuick attendance and Rapid Track system	1.2. End of Year Assessment to verify 2012-2013 goals were achieved
3	1.3. The school does not have the resources to track down absent students and contact parents of students habitually absent.	1.3. Implement callouts to students who miss school	1.3. Assistant Principal	1.3. Monthly review of 10+ absences to monitor progress	1.3. End of Year Assessment to verify 2012-2013 goals were achieved

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
Attendance Policies/Procedures	All	Both	School-wide	August 2012	Monitoring of Teacher Attendance Accuracy	Assistant Principal over Attendance
School-wide Positive Behavior Support	All	Both	School-wide	August 2012	Monitoring of Student Tardiness	Assistant Principal over Attendance, SWPBS Team

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In order to improve class attendance and student performance, faculty and staff will implement policies to reduce the number of in and out-of-school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
In 2012, the total number of in-school suspensions was 580.	In 2013, the total number of in-school suspensions will be fewer than 400.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In 2012, the total number of students suspended in-school was 368.	In 2013, the total number of students suspended in-school will be fewer than 200.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In 2012, the total number of out-of-school suspensions was 539.	In 2013, the total number of out-of-school suspensions will be fewer than 400.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In 2012, the total number of students suspended out-of-school was 333.	In 2013, the total number of students suspended out-of-school will be fewer than 200

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. Over-reliance on suspension as a method to maintain discipline on campus	1.1. Leadership team will develop and provide professional development to all faculty and staff regarding the School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) plan and disciplinary alternatives to suspension contained within said plan.	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1.Tracking of in-school and out-of-school suspension rates among students	1.1. Student in-school and out-of-school suspension rates
2	1.2. Individual students committing repeated infractions leading to higher overall suspension numbers.	1.2. Deans and other support staff will document interventions to facilitate re-placement of students who may be unsuccessful in this learning environment.	1.2. Deans and other support staff.	1.2.Tracking of in-school and out-of-school suspension rates among students	1.2. Student in-school and out-of-school suspension rates
3	1.3. Students dealing with out-of-school issues that lead to inappropriate in-school behaviors.	1.3. All school faculty and staff will work to identify students who may need additional support to the MTSS team. The MTSS team	1.3. All School faculty and staff, MTSS Team	1.3.Tracking of in-school and out-of-school suspension rates among students	1.3. Student in-school and out-of-school suspension rates

		will identify and enact appropriate interventions for these students.				

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
School-Wide Positive Behavior Support	All	Both	School-wide	August 2012	Monitoring of suspension/discipline rates	Administration

---

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who*	For the 2011-12 school year, the drop-out rate was 2%. For the 2012-13 school year, the drop-out rate will not increase.

dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
For the 2011-12 school year, the drop-out rate was 2%.	For the 2012-13 school year, the drop-out rate will be 2% or lower.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
The 2012 current graduation rate is at 75%	The 2013 expected graduation rate will be at 78%.

		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. High number of students falling behind graduation requirements	1.1. Leadership team will provide professional development regarding graduation requirements and strategies to make students aware of and help them meet these requirements.	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Monitoring of EDW data on graduation cohorts.	1.1. EDW data on graduation cohorts
2	1.2. Lack of support for students to provide assistance with academic/personal issues	1.2. The faculty and staff will identify students in need of additional assistance and refer these students to the school social worker or to Communities in Schools so that students can provided assistance and direction toward additional resources.	1.2. Leadership Team	1.2. Reports from school social worker and Communities in Schools liason	1.2. EDW data on graduation cohorts
3	1.3. Lack of career plan/college goals to motivate students toward graduation.	1.3. Staff members in the school's career center and college readiness coaches will work to ensure that students develop a post-graduation plan.	1.3. Career Center staff and college readiness coaches.	1.3. Monitoring of EDW data on graduation cohorts.	1.3. EDW data on graduation cohorts

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
Graduation Requirement	All	Both	School-wide	November 2012	Monitoring of graduation rates and student progress toward meeting graduation goals	Guidance Department/Graduation Coaches/Administration

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Based on attendance at parent activities, there is less than a 10% parent attendance rate in 2012. In 2013 we would like to see at least 20% of our parents attend at least one or more parent activities, therefore increasing the parent participation rate by at least 15%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2012 less than 10% of parents participated in parent activities.	In 2013 at least 20% of parents will participate in parent activities.

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 Lack of parental involvement in school-based decision making	1.1. Hold annual Title I Parent meeting and month SAC meetings. Through these meetings, parents will have the opportunity to be involved in design, implementation, and evaluation of school-wide programs.	1.1. Title 1 Coordinator	1.1. Title I family involvement survey	1.1. Meeting agendas and sign-in sheets

2	1.2. Lack of parental knowledge regarding opportunities and programs for their children	1.2. Host four parent university/trainings/ workshops that will inform parents of curriculum, assessments, and proficiency levels students are expected to meet. Parents will be encouraged to participate in decision making opportunities about their child's education.	1.2. Guidance Counselors Title I Coordinator Principal Graduation Coach	1.2. Meeting Minutes Student Achievement	1.2.Meeting agendas and sign-in sheets
3	1.3. Language barriers between parents and the school	1.3. Hold two parent leadership meetings for all bilingual parents. This further encourages parents to participate in decision making opportunities about their child's education.	1.3. ELL Coordinator	1.3.Parent attendance and participation	1.3. Meeting Agenda and minutes

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 Conferencing	9-12	Both	9-12 Teachers; Guidance Counselors	August 2012	Parent-Teacher-Guidance Conference Logs	Administration

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
Parent Involvement Materials	Supplies, paper, toner for EDW reports, refreshments, pamphlets for parents, resource books, flash drives, pens, etc.	Title I	$3,250.00

Parent Trainings	Stipend for part-time parent training facilitators	Title I	$1,250.00
Postage & Freight	Parent Mailings	Title I	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $6,000.00
			Grand Total: $6,000.00

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:	Based on the school's need to improve math goals and achieve high performance levels on the biology EOC, more emphasis will be placed on STEM subject areas in order to boost student 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	1.1. Lack of student engagement and rigor in classroom instruction	1.1. Teachers will review test item specifications, content standards, and curriculum materials during common planning times in order to develop lesson plans that include higher-order questioning and activities at a moderate to high cognitive complexity level.	1.1. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.1. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.1. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.
2	1.2. Lack of opportunity for students to take ownership of the material they are expected to master	1.2. Teachers will participate in trainings on 5E and the gradual release model of instruction in order to plan lessons and display board configurations that reflect the use of these instructional strategies.	1.2. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.2. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.2. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.
3	1.3. Skill gaps in scientific math, scientific writing, and lab skills.	1.3. The science department will deliver a series of lab activities to students that incorporate math problems, scientific writing, and lab techniques.	1.3. Instructional coach, principal, and assistant principal over science.	1.3. Lesson plan review and classroom walkthroughs.	1.3. Lesson plans and classroom walkthrough logs.

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
5E/Gradual Release Strategies	Science (9-12)	Both	Science Department	August 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
Test Item Specifications	Biology	Both	Biology Teachers	September 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration
STEM Skill Lab Trainings	Science (9-12)	Both	Science Department	On-Going	Classroom Walkthroughs/Lesson Plans	Department Instructional Leaders/Administration

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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
	Meeting with the necessary district and state personnel to assist with this project	1.1. Call Gloria Bailey (State) and James Cooper (District) to set	1.1. CTE Coordinator; CTE AP	1.1. Meeting Itself and Meeting Minutes	1.1. Periodic Walk-through Forms

1		up a meeting during preschool week and ask both to bring sample timelines they have received from other programs like ours.		Checking progress of the timelines throughout the year	
2	1.2. Getting the teachers to participate and complete the activity to be included in their teacher binders	1.2. Set a deadline for the timelines to be created and submitted (at a CTE school meeting attended by the AP and Principal) for discussion.	1.2. CTE Coordinator; CTE AP; Principal	1.2. Meeting and the Meeting Minutes Survey for teacher feedback	1.2. Teacher Annual Evaluation Instrument

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
Creation of CTE Timelines	All CTE Courses	District CTE Facilitator	All CTE Teachers	October 2012	Monitoring of lesson plans' adherence to timelines	Assistant Principal over CTE
CTE Content Knowledge Updates	All CTE Courses	District CTE Facilitator	All CTE Teachers	On-Going	Monitoring of lesson plans and walkthroughs	Assistant Principal over CTE

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Establishing an adult advocate for each student Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Establishing an adult advocate for each student Goal Establishing an adult advocate for each student Goal #1:	The school currenlty has multiple systems to provide adult advocates for students (home room teacher, guidance counselor, case manager, etc.), however it is the school's goal to provide a system for these advocates to continue to work with the same students for those students' entire educational experience.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
The school currenlty has multiple systems to provide adult advocates for students (home room teacher, guidance counselor, case manager, etc.), but these advocates change for each student each school year.	The school's goal to provide a system for adult advocates to continue to work with the same students for those students' entire educational experience.

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	It is difficult to schedule the same students to the same homeroom teacher over a multiple-year period.	We will examine the feasibility of matching students with the same homeroom teacher over multiple years.	Administration	Comparison of homeroom teacher rosters from year to year	Student schedules pairing them with a consistent homeroom teacher over multiple years

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Establishing an adult advocate for each student Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutors	Title I	$12,500.00
Reading	Classroom Instructional Materials	Paper, toner, printer cartridges, pens, markers, charts, journals, classroom libraries, etc.	Title I	$4,000.00
Mathematics	Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutors	Title I	$6,250.00
Mathematics	On-Line/Computer-Based Instructional Programs	Computer hardware	Title I	$2,100.00
Mathematics	Instructional Materials	Supplies (toner, paper, pens, markers, charts, calculators, manipulatives, clickers)	Title I	$10,000.00
Mathematics	On-Line/Computer-Based Instructional Programs	Lap-top computers and mobile charging cart	Title I	$22,900.00
Science	Tutoring	Stipend for part-time tutors	Title I	$6,250.00
Science	Instructional Materials	Classroom supplies, lab materials, paper, toner, consumable lab supplies, pens	Title I	$3,500.00
Writing	Tutoring	Stipends for part-time tutoring	Title I	$3,375.00
Writing	Instructional Materials	Supplies, journals, charts, paper, markers, toner	Title I	$1,484.00
				Subtotal: $72,359.00

Technology

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

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Coach/LTF	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Reading	Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), registrations (IRA, ASCD, NABSE, High School Principal's Conference)	Title I	$10,000.00
Mathematics	Math Coach	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Mathematics	Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), registrations (AP Conferences, NCTM, NSDC, High School Principal's Conference)	Title I	$6,000.00
Science	Science Coach	Salary/Benefits	Title I	$67,588.00
Science	Professional Development Conferences	Travel (out of state), conference registrations (AP conferences, NCTM, NSDC, High School Principals Conference)	Title I	$6,000.00
Writing	Professional Development Conferences	In-county workshops, College Board/AP workshops, Writing conferences)	Title I	$2,125.00
				Subtotal: $226,889.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
		Supplies, paper, toner		

Parent Involvement	Parent Involvement Materials	for EDW reports, refreshments, pamphlets for parents, resource books, flash drives, pens, etc.	Title I	$3,250.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Trainings	Stipend for part-time parent training facilitators	Title I	$1,250.00
Parent Involvement	Postage & Freight	Parent Mailings	Title I	$1,500.00
				Subtotal: $6,000.00
				Grand Total: $305,248.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j͡n Priority	j͡n Focus	j͡n Prevent	j͡n NA

Are you a reward school: j͡n Yes j͡n No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/21/2012)

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
Support for academic departments through funding for instructional supplies and technology	$19,000.00

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

SIP Revision
Updating community on student academic progress and overall test results
Interaction between SAC members and Department Heads: members will be informed about course offerings and curriculum
Awareness and attendance of Family Involvement Workshops
Seeking new approaches to increasing parent involvement

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Palm Beach School District PALM BEACH LAKES HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	22%	54%	80%	29%	185	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	37%	63%			100	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	42% (NO)	64% (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					391	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District PALM BEACH LAKES HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	21%	55%	89%	30%	195	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	40%	71%			111	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	41% (NO)	71% (YES)			112	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					418	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested