FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: STRANAHAN HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Deborah Owens

SAC Chair: Eric McLaughlin

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Deborah Owens	Professional Certificate in Health K-12, Middle Grades Science and Educational Leadership K-12	8	17	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
					2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A

Assis Principal	Alice Thurston	BA in Elementary Education, Masters in Computer Science, Certification-Math, Computer Science, Educational Leadership	8	8	Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Assis Principal	Elvin Hazell	Masters in Educational Leadership, Professional Certificate in Social Science and Sociology 6-12 and Educational Leadership K-12	3	3	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Assis Principal	Bernadine Dorantes	Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education, Master of Science, Counseling and Human Development, Doctorate of Education, Educational Leadership, Adult and community Education. Certifications/Endorsements: Educational Leadership, K-12 Guidance and Counseling, K-12 Elementary Education 1-6 Physical Education, 1-6 FORPD-CAR-PD Completer	3	10	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Assis Principal	Paul Seay	Bachelors of Arts, Elementary Education, Masters in Educational Leadership, Certificates/Endorsements: ESOL Endorsement	2	9	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Dorina Varsamis	Bachelors of Arts, N-9 Education; Masters in Socials Science: History; Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership; Professional Certificate Social Science Middle School ; Social Science 6-12 Certificates/Endorsements: Reading Endorsement; Gifted Certification; ESOL Endorsement	3	3	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Math	Janet Hornik	Masters in Guidance/& Counseling, Professional Certificate in Math 6-12, Guidance K-12, Gifted K-12, ESOL Endorsed.	20	9	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Writing	Cinda Kane	Masters in Curriculum & Instruction and English Professional Certificate in English 6-12 and Journalism. National Board Certified Teacher. Gifted Endorsed, ESOL Endorsed, Reading Endorsed.	11	7	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.
Science	Georgette Trelor	Masters in Educational Leadership, Professional Certificate in Biology and Chemistry 9-12, ESO L Endorsed, NBPTS Certified Biology AYA.	20	5	2011-2012 Grade Pending Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 49% Science Mastery: N/A Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: There are no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2010-11 Grade: B Reading Mastery : 41% Math Mastery :75% Science Mastery :39% Writing Mastery :84% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math. 2009-10 Grade : B Reading Mastery :43% Math Mastery :74% Writing Mastery :90% AYP : There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading and Math.

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	Magnet Program	Juan Formoso/Maria Hanrahan	Ongoing	
2	Fairs	Deborah Owens	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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
90	2.2%(2)	15.6%(14)	27.8%(25)	54.4%(49)	58.9%(53)	97.8%(88)	8.9%(8)	11.1%(10)	95.6%(86)

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
Gabriel Andrews	1	Department Chair	Mentoring through Department Chair and Peer Coaching
Krystal Curling	1	Department Chair	Mentoring through Department Chair and Peer Coaching
Edwin Meagher	1	Department Chair	Mentoring through Department Chair and Peer Coaching
Jared Villalobos	1	Department Chair	Mentoring through Department Chair and Peer Coaching

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Title II District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Dropout Prevention programs.
Guidance: Ester Dawkins, Tracey Walton

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

Title X- Homeless Our homeless/foster care designee in guidance ensures the provision of services for these students. Along with the social worker, identified needs such as clothing and transportation will be provided through county and district resources.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before, and after schools, and for additional instructional support during the school day. 21st Century Grant

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs
The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that include field trips, community service, and counseling. Local Police Agencies

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs Students are encouraged to participate in the free and reduced meal program, if eligible. It is strongly recommended and encouraged for all students to eat both breakfast and lunch to help maintain nutritional wellness. Students receive additional nutritional information through their science, health and culinary arts classes.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Career and Technical Education – Automotive Technology, Arlene Hennis - Business, Medical Office Tech, Michele Levitch – Health Sciences, Edward Steinlauf – Accounting, Lana Tillman – Culinary Arts, Juan Teyssandier – Engineering Tech

Job Training

Job Training Yes-through internships (magnet, SLC and CTE).

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Deborah Owens, Intern Principal: Bernadine Dorantes, Assistant Principal: Elvin Hazell, ELL Coordinator: Allison Clarke, ESE Specialist: Eric McLaughlin, Guidance Director: Ester Dawkins, Social Worker: Ellen Williams, School Psychologist: Dani Coll, Magnet Coordinator: Juan Formoso , Math Coach/Gen. Ed/Teacher: Janet Hornik and Reading Coach: Dorina Varsamis.

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 RtI Leadership team meets on a bi-weekly, basis or when a specific case is required. The RtI Leadership defines the problem, analyzes the problem using data, implements the appropriate intervention, and evaluates the effectiveness of the intervention. As the RtI Leadership analyzes individual cases, it follows a set of tiered interventions for both academic and behavioral problems. The Leadership Team provides guidance in assessment administration, data analysis, core curriculum implementation, selecting intervention resources and planning intervention strategies as well as monitoring student progress, planning professional development, and providing assistance for students not making sufficient progress. The administrator acts as the coordinator and facilitator of the bi-weekly meetings. The guidance director acts as the case manager of the RTI Leadership Team.

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

The SIP serves as a blueprint of the actions and processes needed to produce school improvement. The RtI Leadership Team work together to implement the SIP, review student data and adjust goals, strategies, and professional development as necessary. After disaggregating data, the Instructional Focus Calendars are developed by the team and are monitored and adjusted according to data results from the benchmark assessments. Students who are identified for RtI are given extra/unique interventions to increase their academic success/student achievement.

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.

SHS uses the data from the state, district and informal assessments in order to place students into classes that will best meet their needs. This data is also collected throughout the year to follow student performance, to determine what instructional strategies have been effective, and to determine new strategies for increased student achievement. As the RtI Leadership analyzes individual cases, it follows a set of tiered interventions for both academic and behavioral problems. Academically in Tier 1, students are served through the district's core curriculum. In Tier 2, a small percentage of students are targeted with interventions and a smaller percentage in Tier 3, which consists of comprehensive and intensive individualized interventions. The majority of behavior is served through Tier 1 through universal interventions. Tier 2 and 3 targets a much smaller population, which involves more intensive and individualized intervention. The data collected throughout the year will focus on six key component areas, serving students well, data-driven decision-making, collaborative problem-solving, on-going assessments of student learning, interventions and documentation of results, and the use of zone, area, and district support and professional development.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All teachers will be offered the opportunity to receive staff development in how to identify instructional strategies that will facilitate student achievement. Teachers will access in-service training, based on training needs, as determined by the PGP assessment process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Team: Principal: Deborah Owens,, Intern Principal: Alice Thurston, Intern Principal: Bernadine Dorantes, Assistant Principal: Elvin Hazel, ELL Coordinator: Allison Clarke, ESE Specialist: Eric McLaughlin, Guidance Director: Ester Dawkins, Social Worker: Ellen Williams, School Psychologist: Dani Coll, Magnet Coordinator: Juan Formoso , Math Coach/Gen. Ed/Teacher: Janet Hornik, Writing Coach: Cinda Kane and Reading Coach : Dorina Varsamis.

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

The LLT Leadership Team provides guidance in assessment administration, data analysis, core curriculum implementation, selecting intervention resources and planning intervention strategies as well as monitoring student progress, planning professional development, and providing assistance for students not making sufficient progress.

The LLT Leadership Team will meet the second Tuesday of every month. Information will be disseminated via the Department Chairs.

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

The LLT Leadership Team works together to implement the SIP, review student data and adjust goals, strategies, and professional development as necessary. After disaggregating data the School Wide Literacy Instructional Focus Calendars are developed by the team (with feedback and buy in from the departments) and are monitored and adjusted according to data results from the benchmark assessments. Special focus on learning gains and lower quartile in all subgroups including higher order questions and understanding. All schools must align all Language Arts and Reading courses to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State Standards. The LLT will also train content area teachers in implementing Reporting Categories into their curriculum.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

On a bi-weekly basis, the Reading Coach will build the knowledge base of all teachers via morning Mini-Professional learning communities (PLC's) to provide a foundation of effective instruction and assessment strategies teachers can infuse across all content areas and areas of discipline. School Wide Instructional Literacy Focus Calendar will also be used by all departments (excluding the math) aligning with the FCAT 2.0 reading instructional focus, Common Core State Standards and Marzano's instructional framework.

The first target of Mini-PLC's will focus on 6 CCSS shifts: Balancing Informational and Literary Text, Knowledge in the Disciplines, Staircase of Complexity, Text-based Answers, Writing from Sources and Academic Vocabulary. The second target of Mini-PLC's will focus on authentic and effective student assessments, to include developing rubrics, incorporating formative real time student feedback and self-reflection. Teachers will also differentiate instruction in order to provide a learning environment that will maximize the potential for student success.

Teachers will use Cognitive Complexity Questioning Techniques in order for students to demonstrate critical thinking, have a better understanding of the type of higher order questioning on the FCAT, and be able to identify the type of question and answer it with 80% accuracy.

*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?

SHS allows students to have real world applications in connection to their future course of studies. For example, every 90 days, a blood drive is held allowing students the opportunity to see what the health care field does. Students who are in the business magnet participate in competitions both on and off campus throughout the years. Fundraisers are held and family nights are organized to show community members how the school educates their students. College and Job fairs are held every other month. Magnet students compete in International and National Robotics competition and demonstrate their knowledge of engineering. Horticulture students are visibly working on our campus, which are recognized as a Natural Habitat for both plant and wild life. As the students care for the trees and plants on the campus, they also understand how to run a nursery and preserve a national preserve. Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment classes allow student to take college level classes while they are still in the high school setting. Internships are offered for students who are interested. JROTC students have a feel of what it is like to serve in the military and recruiters are off and on campus on a weekly basis. The Guidance Counselors are constantly making students aware of the opportunities to serve the community, work off campus and apply for scholarships to pay for their future education. School is considering implementation of CAPE Academies. Dual enrollment courses have been increased.

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?

Select students have mentors from comprised of community members who visit with them each week to ensure they attend and that their academics are up to par. Urban Teaching Academy Programs allow students who are interested in the teaching profession an opportunity to create lesson plans and teach elementary, middle and high school students are they prepare to enter the teaching field. HOSA students are able to go off campus, work in hospitals, and serve as interns in the health care field. Auto tech students have access to a fully equipped auto tech lab that allows them to learn how to not only build an engine, but also fix and repair any and every problem that affects an automotive engine. Students work on their own cars as well as community members cars. Students have the option to participate in technical dual enrollment with articulation to local colleges.

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

All 10th grade students will take the PSAT in October 2012. In December 2012 Guidance counselors will meet with students individually to assist them in interpreting score reports. Counselors will also utilize the services of classroom teachers to assist students in address and improving deficiencies.

In an effort to increase our Advanced Placement participation, counselors will utilize several instruments including the State of Florida Academic Placement Matrix, AP Potential report, and test scores for proper student placement. Parents of students who fall below the requirements are allowed to utilize the waiver option. Additionally, students who meet the dual enrollment criteria are encouraged to pursue that option on-site or at Broward College.

Counselors will closely monitor students GPA, courses, SAT/ACT/CPT scores and take appropriate actions in assisting students to meet Bright Futures Scholarship requirements.

Student identified as college ready but have not earned the scores required for traditional universities are provided with the opportunity to take the CPT. Through the Dragon Heat After School programs students are able to participate in CPT, ACT and SAT prep courses taught by subject area teachers. All juniors are strongly encouraged to take the ACT and SAT exams at least once during their junior year. Seniors are encouraged to retake either of the two exams repeated in an effort to increase scores.

To provide students with first-hand knowledge pertaining to various careers, the academies host a career day with presentations from specific professional organizations educating students on careers within each academy. Presentations cover educational requirements, starting salaries, and growth within the industry. Post-secondary institutions are also included as they are able to provide information on entrance requirements, tuition costs and degree programs. In addition, the CREST Academy on the Human Resource Day Event provides small group presentations where professionals from various organizations rotate through classrooms and share the expectations of professional businesses and organizations when hiring potential candidates. Students are provided the opportunity to ask questions that are specifically aligned with the profession being represented in each group. Additionally, through the medical magnet and engineering programs, select students are given meaningful internship, mentorship and unique experience in their field of choice as prescribed by their academy.

At the beginning of the sophomore year, upon selection of a technical course, students are encouraged to be program completers in their chosen career technical pathway. Upon completion they will take the industry certification exam thus increasing the number of students graduating with marketable skills.

Parent University will be held on campus to educate all parents about scholarships, financial aid, application processes for post-secondary institutions, advancements, dual enrollment and all graduation requirements.

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:	In grades 9-10, 28% of the students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grades 9-10th 24% (199)	Grades 9-10th 28% (165)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Language Barrier 1.2. Lack of motivation 1.3. Lack of Parental Involvement 1.4. ELL students: lack of English academic materials in the home 1.5. Lack of fluency in English 1.6.Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated) 1.7 Primary courses controlled by the school. 1.8 Lack of technology at students' homes.	1.1. Weekly FCAT 2.0 and Common Cores State Standards instructional focus warm-ups/Text Complexity/Relevance and Rigor 1.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms with students who are Level 3 (Enrichment and project-based activities). 1.3 Infusion of FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories 1.4 Re-teaching of unmastered concepts from mini-assessments, FAIR, and BAT results. 1.5 Incorporate meta-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons 1.6 Use of research based strategies for pre, during and after reading. 1.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 1.8 Sharing best practices 1.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 2.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build	1.1. Reading Coach, Reading Department Chair and Assistant Principal	1.1. Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal (Tier I- 1 time per week) 1.2. Examination of student work 1.3. Data Chat 1.4 Literacy IFC aligned to the new generation standards for grades 9 and 10 and infusion of Common Core State Standards 1.5 ACT Practice Assessment monitored by Princeton Review/College Board (feedback provided) 1.6 Reading Coach will push-in and model Common Core State Standards and Effective Literacy Strategies in preparation for FCAT 2.0 high stakes exam.	1.1. BAT/FCAT 2.0 1.2 In-house Mini assessments 1.3 In-house formative Assessments by classroom teacher 1.4 Proper Reading Placement based on the District Placement Chart. 1.5 Master Schedule complies with scheduling for rigor, remediation, acceleration, enrichment and common 5th Period planning. 1.6 Use of BEEP, the adopted Text and customized IFC's to deliver instruction. 1.7 The Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). 1.8 ACT Princeton Review Practice Assessment. 1.9 Reading Plus Technology Program

		stamina. 2.1 Daily opportunities to answer and generate their own questions. 2.2 Teacher-generated questions to give a purpose for reading and to guide students toward deeper interactions with the text. 2.3 ACT/Practice Weekly Reading, Science and Social Studies (11-12) 2.4 Reading Plus Technology –minimum 3 times a week. 2.5 FAIR Assessment-FCAT levels 1-3 Assessment monitored 3 times per year.			

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:	In grades 9-10, 43% of the students will achieve proficiency for reading on the F.A.A. and FCAT 2013 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (4)	43% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1.Students have limited intellectual abilities.	1b.1.Personalized differentiated instruction. 1.b.2 Modified Curriculum	1b.1.ESE Specialist, ESE Department Chair School, School Administration	1b.1.Accesspoints	1b.1.F.A.A.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades, 9-10, 25 % of the Level 4 and 5 students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9-10th 21% (168)	9-10th 25% (160)

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. Students are not	2.1. Push-in via Social	2.1. Reading	2.1 Classroom	2.1BAT/FCAT

1	enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated) 2.2 Lack of motivation 2.3 Lack of parental involvement 2.4 Enrolled in rigor courses. 2.5 Lack of technology in students' homes.	Studies, Science, World Languages and CTACE classes by reading teachers, department chair and Reading Coach. 2.2 Weekly FCAT 2.0 and Common Cores State Standards instructional focus warm-ups/Text Complexity/Relevance and Rigor 2.3 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms for Level 4 and 5 students). Enrichment and Accelerated activities/project based learning activities 2.4 Infusion of FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories 2.5 Re-teaching of unmastered concepts from in-house/class mini-assessments and BAT results. 2.6 Incorporate meta-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons 2.7 Use of research based strategies. 2.8 Incorporate Novel Study/Content Literacy Study in the classrooms that contain Level 4 and 5 students. 2.9 Sharing best practices 3.0 Use of graphic organizers with daily assessment teacher lessons. 3.1 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina. 3.2 More rigorous curriculum. 3.3 ACT/Practice Weekly Reading, Science and Social Studies (11-12) 3.4 Reading Plus Technology –minimum 3 times a week. 3.5 FAIR Assessment-FCAT levels 1-5 Assessment monitored 3 times per year.	Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 2.2 Examination of student work 2.3 Data Chats 2.4 ACT Practice Assessment monitored by Princeton Review/College Board (feedback provided)	2.2 In-house Mini assessments 2.3 In-house formative Assessments by classroom teacher 2.4 ACT Princeton Review Practice Assessment. 2.5 Reading Plus Technology Program Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	In grades, 9-10, 23% of the Level 4 and 5 students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (5)	23% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1.Students have limited intellectual abilities.	2b.1.Personalized differentiated instruction. 2.b.2 Modified Curriculum	2b.1. ESE Specialist, ESE Department Chair, School Administration	2b.1.Access points	2b.1.F.A.A., FCAT

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades, 9-10, 66 % of students making learning gains in reading will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9-10th 61% (485)	9-10th 66% (425)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1 Language Barrier 3.2 Lack of motivation 3.3 Lack of Parental Involvement 3.4 ELL students: lack of English academic materials in the home 3.5 Lack of fluency in English 3.6 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated) 3.7 Lack of technology in students' homes.	3.1. Weekly instructional focus FCAT 2.0 and Common Core State Standards warm-ups 3.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 3.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 3.4 Re-teaching of unmastered concepts from in-house mini-assessments and BAT results. 3.5 Incorporate metag-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 3.6 Use of research based strategies. 3.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast,	3.1Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	3.1. Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 3.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes based on Reading Plus Performance. 3.3 Examination and monthly consultation based on overall student progress and performance. 3.4 Quarterly Student and Teacher Data Chats 3.4 ACT Practice Assessment monitored by Princeton Review/College Board (feedback provided) 3.5 Reading Coach will push-in and model Common Core State Standards and Effective Literacy Strategies in preparation for FCAT 2.0 high stakes exam.	3.1. BAT/FCAT 3.2 In-house Mini assessments 3.3 In-house formative Assessment by classroom teacher 3.4 IPT/CELLA 3.5 FAIR Assessment 3.6 9-12th Grade will be tested on the FCAT 2.0 reporting categories Based 3.8 ACT Princeton Review Practice Assessment. 3.9 Reading Plus Technology Program

		Cause/Effect assessments. 3.8 Sharing best practices 3.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 4.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina 4.1 ACT/Practice Weekly Reading, Science and Social Studies (11-12) 4.2 Reading Plus Technology –minimum 3 times a week. 4.3 FAIR Assessment-FCAT levels 1-3 Assessment monitored 3 times per year.			

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:	In grades, 9-10, 85% of students making learning gains in reading will achieve mastery for reading on the 2012 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (4)	85% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. Students have limited intellectual abilities.	3b.1.Personalized differentiated instruction. 3.b.2. Modified Curriculum	3b.1.ESE Specialist, ESE Department Chair, School Administration	3b.1.Access Points	3b.1.F.A.A.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 9-10, 68% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will achieve mastery for Reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9-10th 64% (130)	9-10th 68% (120)

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	4.1. Language Barrier 4.2 Lack of motivation 4.3 Lack of Parental Involvement and academic materials in the home 4.6 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated) 4.7 Primary courses controlled by the school 4.8 More interventions needed for intensive students 4.9 Lack of technology in students' homes.	4.1. Weekly instructional focus FCAT 2.0 and Common Core State Standards warm-ups 4.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 4.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories/New Test Specs (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 4.4 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from mini-assessments and BAT results. 4.5 Incorporate Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 4.6 Use of research based strategies. 4.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 4.8 Sharing best practices 4.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 5.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina. 5.1 Double Dose (attend Reading classes daily) 5.2 Pull-outs/Push-ins 5.3 Implement motivational activities to stimulate student interest in Reading. 5.4 Word of the Day. 5.5 ACT/Practice Weekly Reading, Science and Social Studies (11-12) 5.6 Reading Plus Technology –minimum 3 times a week. 5.7 FAIR Assessment-FCAT levels 1-5 Assessment monitored 3 times per year.	4.1Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	4.1. Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 4.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes. 4.3 Examination of student work 4.4 Data Chats 4.5 Examination of students work 4.6 Model Classroom for students who are in need of double dose of reading interventions (Lower Quartile) 4.7 ACT Practice Assessment monitored by Princeton Review/College Board (feedback provided)	4.1. BAT/FCAT 4.2 Mini assessments 4.3 In-house 4.4 FAIR Assessment 4.5 ACT Princeton Review Practice Assessment. 4.6 Reading Plus Technology Program

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : By June 2016-2017 all subgroups: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, ELL, SWD, and FRL will reduce the reading achievement gap by 4% for each year leading up to school year 2016-2017.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	45%	52%	56%	60%	64%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013 at least all of the student subgroups by ethnicity will increase by 4% to achieve a level 3 or higher on the Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 53% Black:41% Hispanic:48% Asian:72% American Indian: 0%	White: 57% Black: 45% Hispanic:52% Asian: 76% American Indian: 0%

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	5.1 Lack of motivation 5.3 Lack of Parental Involvement 5.3 Lack of academic materials including technology in the home 5.5 Lack of fluency in English 5.6 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated)	1.1.Monthly instructional focus/bell ringers 5.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (general ed., ELL, and ESE) 5.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories/New Test Specs (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 5.4 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from mini-assessments and BAT results. 5.5 Incorporate Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 5.6 Use of research-based strategies. 5.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 5.8 Sharing best practices 5.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 6.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina. 6.1 Double Dose (attend Reading classes daily) 6.2 Pull-outs/Push-ins 6.3 Implement motivational activities to stimulate student interest in Reading.	5A.1Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	5A.1. Administrative and Dept Look Fors conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 5.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes. 5.3 Examination of student work 5.4 Data Chats 5.5 Model Classroom 5.6 Media center opened from 3-5 for students in need of technology.	5A.1.. BAT/FCAT 5.2 Mini-assessments 5.3 In-houseassessment-teacher 5.4 FAIR assessment

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.	By June 2013 at least 24% of the English Language Learners (ELL) students will score a level 3 or higher on the Reading

Reading Goal #5C:	FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20%	24%

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	5.1Language Barrier 5.2 Lack of motivation 5.3 Lack of Parental Involvement 5.4 ELL students: lack of English academic materials in the home 5.5 Lack of fluency in English 5.6 Students on assessment scores	B.1.Monthly instructional focus/bell ringers 5.2 Differentiated Instruction in all ELL classrooms 5.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories/New Test Specs (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 5.4 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from mini-assessments and BAT results. 5.5 Incorporate Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 5.6 Use of research-based strategies. 5.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 5.8 Sharing best practices 5.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons.	5B.1. Reading Coach, ELL Department Chair and Assistant Principal	5B.1. Administrative and Dept Look Fors conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 5.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes. 5.3 Examination of student work 5.4 Data Chats	5B.. BAT/FCAT 5.2 Mini-assessments 5.3 In-house assessment-teacher 5.4 IPT/CELLA 5.4 FAIR Assessment 5.5 Parent Conferences to discuss additional strategies for ELL students

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013 at least 21% of the Students with Disabilities will score a level 3 or higher on the Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%	21%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5.1 Lack of motivation 5.2 Lack of Parental Involvement	5B.1.Monthly instructional focus/bell ringers	5D.1.Reading Coach, Department Chair and	5D.1 Administrative and Dept Look Fors conducted by Reading	5D.1. BAT/FCAT 5.2 Mini-assessments

1	5.3. Lack of academic materials in the home 5.6 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district mandated)	5.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (general ed., ELL, and ESE) 5.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories/New Test Specs (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 5.4 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from mini-assessments and BAT results. 5.5 Incorporate Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 5.6 Use of research-based strategies. 5.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 5.8 Sharing best practices 5.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 6.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina. 6.1 Double Dose (attend Reading classes daily) 6.2 Pull-outs/Push-in's 6.3 Implement motivational activities to stimulate student interest in Reading.	Assistant Principal	Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 5.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes. 5.3 Examination of student work 5.4 Data chats	5.3 In-house assessment-teacher 5.4 FAIR Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2013 at least 45% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will score a level 3 or higher on the Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%	45%

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
	5.1 Lack of motivation 5.2 Lack of Parental Involvement 5.3 ELL students: lack of English academic materials in the home 5.5 Lack of fluency in English 5.6 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on	5.1Monthly instructional focus/bell ringers 5.2 Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 5.3 Incorporation of Reporting Categories/New Test Specs (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and	5.1 Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	5D.1 Administrative and Dept Look Fors conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal. 5.2 Weekly, Bi-weekly, and monthly contests among individual students/classes. 5.3 Examination of student work	5.1 BAT/FCAT 5.2 Mini-assessments 5.3 In-houseassessment-teacher 5.4 FAIR Assessments

1	assessment scores (state and district mandated)	Informational Text/Research Process) 5.4 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from mini-assessments and BAT results. 5.5 Incorporate Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 5.6 Use of research-based strategies. 5.7 Alternative Main Idea, Compare/Contrast, Cause/Effect assessments. 5.8 Sharing best practices 5.9 Use of graphic organizers with daily lessons. 6.0 In-house reading, weekly SSR to build stamina. 6.1 Double Dose (attend Reading classes daily) 6.2 Pull-outs/Push-in's 6.3 Implement motivational activities to stimulate student interest in Reading.		5.4 Data chats	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards PLC- focuses on examining school data and trends, behavioral and academic interventions, instructional strategies, and CPST.	9-12 Reading, World Languages, and Career-Technical Departments	Reading Coach	Reading, World Languages, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts and Career-Technical Departments	Professional Study Days throughout the 2012-13 school year	Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool	Principal and Assistant Principal
Reading PLC- focus on reading strategies in the classroom and using classroom and school data to address Text Complexity, FCAT 2.0 achievement gaps, Marzano Instructional Strategies	9-12 Reading Department	Reading Department Chair	Reading Department	Professional Study Days throughout the 2012-13 school year	Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach.

and Common Core Standards training.						

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	By June of 2013, 20% will meet proficiency on CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
17%	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1.Lack of motivation 1.2 Lack of Parental Involvement 1.3 Lack of academic materials including technology in the home	1.1. Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 1.2 Incorporation of Reporting Categories	1.1.ESOL Coordinator, Reading Coach, Department Chair and	1.1. Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal.	1.1. Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool

1	1.4 Lack of fluency in English 1.5 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district) 1.6 Lack of technology in students' homes.	(Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 1.3 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from in-house mini-assessments and BAT results. 1.4 Incorporate meta-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 1.5 Use of research based strategies.	Assistant Principal		

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:	By June of 2013, 15% will meet proficiency on CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
9%	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Lack of motivation 1.2 Lack of Parental Involvement 1.3 Lack of academic materials including technology in the home 1.4 Lack of fluency in English 1.5 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district) 1.6 Lack of technology in students' homes.	2.1.1.1. Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 1.2 Incorporation of Reporting Categories (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 1.3 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from in-house mini-assessments and BAT results. 1.4 Incorporate meta-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 1.5 Use of research based strategies.	2.1. ESOL Coordinator, Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal	2.1. Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal.	2.1.Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By June of 2013, 20% will meet proficiency on CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
13%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Lack of motivation 1.2 Lack of Parental Involvement 1.3 Lack of academic materials including technology in the home 1.4 Lack of fluency in English 1.5 Students are not enrolled in a Reading class based on assessment scores (state and district) 1.6 Lack of technology in students' homes.	.1.1.1. Differentiated Instruction in all classrooms 1.2 Incorporation of Reporting Categories (Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Informational Text/Research Process) 1.3 Re-teaching of un-mastered concepts from in-house mini-assessments and BAT results. 1.4 Incorporate meta-analysis and Cognitive Complexity questioning techniques in daily lessons. 1.5 Use of research based strategies.	1.1.Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool	1.1.Classroom Walkthroughs conducted by Reading Coach, Department Chair and Assistant Principal.	1.1.Lesson Study, Classroom Walkthrough, Marzano Evaluation Tool

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	By June 2013 50% of the students will score a level 4, 5, or 6 on the mathematical section of the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%	50%

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	1.1Students have limited intellectual ability.	1.1.Small learning environment Modified curriculum	1.1.ESE Specialist ESE Department Chair School Administrator	1.1. Access points	1.1.FAA test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	By June 2013 75% (3) of the students will score at or above level 7 on the mathematical section of the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2)	75% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1Students have reached a cognitive plateau.	2.1. Individualized testing environment Individualized instruction	2.1. ESE Specialist ESE Department Chair School Administrator	2.1.Access points	2.1.FAA test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June 2013 43% (156) of Algebra students will achieve a level 3 on the Algebra EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (139)	43% (156)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students limited familiarity with the new Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC reference sheet 1.2. Lack of familiarity With the computer based testing format of the Algebra EOC. 1.3 Lack of familiarity with doing math on a computer.	1.1Weekly PLC meetings to review and analyze lesson alignment among algebra teachers. 1.2 Students will be given copies of the appropriate reference sheets to be used during algebra instruction 1.3 Students will take the Algebra EOC electronic practice test (ePAT)	Math coach Math competition coordinator School administrator.	Teacher made assessments Mid chapter tests Chapter tests Mini Assessments Reference sheet practice tests	Subject area test results Mini assessment results BAT results

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By June 2013, 16% (58) of Algebra students will achieve levels 4 or 5 on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

11% (41)	16%(58)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Students insufficient motivation toward high academic achievement.	2.1 Provide opportunities and incentives for students to excel in mathematics. ex 1) mathematics competitions 2)projects	2.1. Math coach Math competition coordinator School administrator Math teacher	Teacher made assessments Mid chapter tests Chapter tests Mini Assessments Reference sheet practice tests	Competition participation Classroom Walk Throughs (CWTs)

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A : By June 2016-2017, 74% of ninth grade students taking the Algebra EOC will receive a level 3, 4 or 5.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48%	54%	59%	64%	69%	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By June 2013, 65% of White students, 56% of Black students, 51% of Hispanic students, and 24% of Asian students will score a level 3, 4 or 5 on the Algebra End of Course Exam
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 61% Black: 52% Hispanic:47% Asian:20% American Indian: 0%	White:65% Black:56% Hispanic:51% Asian:24% American Indian: 0%

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. Limited ability to relate mathematics to real life experiences 3B.2. Insufficient math literacy and/or fluency.	3B.1. Infusing mathematical vocabulary during instruction. 3B.2 Create meaningful examples of how Algebra mathematics relates to real life.	3B.1. Math coach 3B.2 School administrator	3B.1. PLC sharing meetings 3B.2 Data chats 3B.3 Daily review activities 3B.4 Vocabulary activities 3B.5 Algebra 1 Lesson Study	3B.1. Student work 3B.2 Mini assessments 3B.3 BAT results 3B. 4 County Midterm

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	By June 2013, 26% of English Language Learners will score a level 3, 4 or5 on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%	74%

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. Insufficient academic language terminology	3C.1. 5.B. Infusing mathematical vocabulary during Algebra instruction. 5B.2 Create meaningful examples of how Algebra mathematics relates to real life.	3C.1. Math coach 3C.2 School administrator	3C.1. PLC sharing meetings 3C.2 Data chats 3C.3 Daily review activities 3C.4 Vocabulary activities 3C.5 Algebra 1 Lesson Study	3C.1. Student work 3C.2 Mini assessments 3C.3 BAT results 3C. 4 County Midterm

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	By June 2013, 45% of Students with Disabilities will score a level 3, 4 or5 on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	55%

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. Insufficient differentiated instructional strategies being used during algebra instruction.	3D.1. Implement technology resources in the classroom. 3D.2 Present interactive activities and lessons. 3D.3 Differentiated assessment products	3D.1. Math coach 3D.2 District support 3D. 3 School administrator	3D.1.Data chats 3D.2.Daily review activities 3D.3 Vocabulary activities 3D.4 Algebra 1 Lesson Study	3D.1 Student work 3D.2 Mini assessments 3D. 3 BAT results 3D. 4 County Midterm

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	By June 2013, 50% of Economically Disadvantaged students will score a level 3, 4 or5 on the Algebra EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

54%	50%

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.Limited comprehension skills necessary for problem solving in mathematics 3E.2Insufficient mathematics literacy and fluency as applied to concept development.	3E.1 Implement technology resources in the classroom. 3E.2 Present interactive activities and lessons. Differentiated assessment products	3E.1Math Coach 3E.2 District support 3E.3 School administration	3E.1.Teacher made assessments 3E. 2 Examination of student work 3E.3 Data Chats 3E. 4 Daily review activities 3E.5 Vocabulary activities	3E.1.Student work 3E.2 Mini assessments 3E. 3 BAT results 3E. 4 County Midterm

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By June 2013 41% (150) of Geometry students will Score a level 3 on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(133)	41%(150)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students limited familiarity with the Geometry EOC reference sheet 1.2. Lack of familiarity and practice with the computer based testing format of the Algebra EOC. 1.3 Lack of familiarity with the calculator used on Geometry CBT.	1.1.Weekly PLC meetings to review and analyze curriculum alignment among geometry teachers. 1.2 Students will be given copies of the Geometry reference Sheets to be used During geometry instruction. 1.3 Students will take the Geometry EOC electronic practice test (ePAT). 1.4 Students will practice in class with the EOC calculators	1.1. Math coach Math competition coordinator School administrator.	1.1. Teacher made assessments Mid chapter tests Chapter tests Mini Assessments Calculator practice tests	1.1 Subject area quizzes. Subject area test results. Mini assessment Results. BAT results

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	By June 2013, 24% (88) of Geometry students will achieve above proficiency (top third) on the Geometry EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(68)	24%(88)

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.Students insufficient motivation toward high academic achievement.	2.1. Provide opportunities and incentives for students to excel in mathematics, including mathematics competitions and projects	2.1. Math teacher Math coach Math competition coordinator School administrator	2.1 Teacher made assessments Mid chapter tests Chapter tests Mini Assessments Reference sheet practice tests	2.1 Competition Participation. Final projects.

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A : By June 2016-2017, 71% of students taking the Geometry EOC will score a level 3, 4 or 5.

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	59%	63%	67%	71%	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	By June 2013 24% of White students, 53% of Black students, 47% of Hispanic students, 100% of Asian students and 37% of American Indian students will score a level 3, 4 or 5 on the Geometry End of Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:29% Black:49% Hispanic:49% Asian:0% American Indian: 33%	White:24% Black:53% Hispanic:47% Asian:0% American Indian: 37%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	3B.1. Limited ability to relate mathematics to real life experiences	3B.1. Infusing mathematical vocabulary during instruction.	3B.1. Math coach 3B.2 School administrator	3B.1. PLC sharing meetings 3B.2 Data chats 3B.3 Daily review	3B.1. Student work 3B.2 Mini assessments

1	3B.2. Insufficient math literacy and/or fluency.	3B.2 Create meaningful examples of how Algebra mathematics relates to real life.		activities 3B.4 Vocabulary activities 3B.5 Geometry Lesson Study	3B.3 BAT results 3B. 4 County Midterm

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	By June 2013, 32% of English Language Learners who take Geometry will score a level 3, 4 or5 on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%	68%

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. Insufficient academic language terminology	3C.1. 5.B. Infusing mathematical vocabulary during Geometry instruction. 5B.2 Create meaningful examples of how Geometry relates to real life.	3C.1Math coach 3C.2 School administrator	3C.1. PLC sharing meetings 3C.2 Data chats 3C.3 Daily review activities 3C.4 Vocabulary activities 3C.5 Geometry Lesson Study	3C.1. Student work 3C.2 Mini assessments 3C.3 BAT results 3C.4 County Midterm

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	By June 2013, 37% of Students with Disabilities taking Geometry will score a level 3, 4 or5 on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%	63%

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. Insufficient differentiated instructional strategies being used during geometry instruction.	3D.1. Implement technology resources in the classroom. 3D.2 Present interactive activities and lessons. 3D.3 Differentiated assessment products	3D.1. Math coach 3D.2 District support 3D. 3 School administrator	3D.1.Data chats 3D.2.Daily review activities 3D.3 Vocabulary activities 3D.4 Geometry Lesson Study	3D.1 Student work 3D.2 Mini assessments 3D. 3 BAT results 3D. 4 County Midterm

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	By June 2013, 48% of Economically Disadvantaged Geometry students will score a level 3, 4 or 5 on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%	52%

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.Limited comprehension skills necessary for problem solving in geometry. 3E.2Insufficient mathematics literacy and fluency as applied to concept development.	3E.1 Implement technology resources in the classroom. 3E.2 Present interactive activities and lessons. Differentiated assessment products	3E.1Math Coach 3E.2 District support 3E.3 School administration	3E.1.Teacher made assessments 3E. 2 Examination of student work 3E.3 Data Chats 3E. 4 Daily review activities 3E.5 Vocabulary activities	3E.1.Student work 3E.2 Mini assessments 3E. 3 BAT results 3E. 4 County Midterm

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
Geometry EOC PLC	Geometry & Geometry Honors	Math Coach	Math Teachers	Early Release days 8 Professional Study Days Monthly Math department meetings	Classroom observations	Math coach School administrator
College Readiness PLC	Math Teachers	Math Coach	Math Teachers	Early Release days; 8 Professional Study Days Monthly Math department meetings	Follow-up assigned after each meeting, portfolios keep on each participant for	Math coach School administrator
Algebra EOC PLC	9th Grade Algebra 1/Algebra 1 Honors; 10th grade Algebra 1B	Math Coach	Math Teachers	Early Release days; 8 Professional Study Days Monthly Math department meetings	Classroom observations	Math coach School administrator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Portfolio Notebooks	Office supplies	SAC	$100.00

			Subtotal: $100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Geometry EOC	Scientific Calculators	Carl Perkins	$1,350.00
			Subtotal: $1,350.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Advanced Placement Calculus	Registration, materials & resources for AP Calculus	SAC	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,950.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	By June 2013 0% of students will be scoring at levels 4, 5 or 6 in Science on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (2)	0% (0)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students have limited intellectual abilities	1.1. Students have limited intellectual abilities	1.1. ESE specialist ESE department chair School administrator	1.1. Access points	1.1. FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	By June 2013, 100% of students will score level 7 or above in Science on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

75% (6)	100% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students have reached their cognitive plateau.	2.1. Modified, individualized testing environment Modified curriculum	2.1. ESE specialist ESE department chair School administrator	2.1. Access points	2.1. FAA

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	By June 2013, 45% of 9th grade and 40% of total Biology students will achieve proficiency (middle third) on the Biology EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (93) 34% (139)	45% (103) 40% (164)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Students not comfortable with computer based testing.	1.1. Use of computers for administration of an increasing number of quizzes and tests throughout the year.	1.1. Department chair Science dept. administrator	1.1. Monitoring as classroom assessments and correlation to student scores.	1.1. Monitoring of test construction and tracking of student achievement on classroom assessments.
2	1.2. Lack of familiarity with higher-order questioning as demonstrated on the EOC.	1.2. Incorporation of higher-order questions, particularly those involving reading passages, charts and graphs on all forms of assessment throughout the year. PLC's will be used to assist teachers in becoming more proficient in the composition of higher-order test questions.	1.2. Classroom teachers Department chair Science dept. administrator	1.2. All teachers will use the same tests and tests will be monitored for progression of inclusion of more higher-order questions as the year progresses. Data chats will be held among teachers as well as between teachers and students after each of the six county mini-assessments.	1.2. Monitoring of mini-assessments and teacher constructed tests as quantity of higher-order questions increases throughout the year.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	By June 2013, 50% of 9th grade and 32% of total Biology students will achieve proficiency (upper third) on the Biology EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (98) 26% (107)	50% (114) 32% (131)

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. Scope of content that needs to be covered due to a large number of benchmarks included in testing.	2.1. Strict adherence to county IFC which focuses on tested standards and revised time frames for coverage	2.1. Department chair Science dept. administrator	2.1. Progress on instructional calendar as determined by Biology team and student achievement in benchmark comprehension. Data chats among teachers following each of 6 mini-assessments to determine progress as well as teacher/student data chats.	2.1. Classroom assessments of students on six county mini-assessments
2	2.2. Lowest cluster in performance in 2012 was 51% proficiency in Molecular and Cellular Biology which also happens to be covered earliest in the school year.	2.2. Development of focus lessons which will concentrate on those seven benchmarks included in this cluster. Reformatting of IFC to allow more time to be spent on the incorporation of a more stringent review prior to the EOC.	2.2. Department chair Biology instructors Science dept. administrator	2.2. Performance of appropriate mini-assessments and teacher constructed assessments. Performance on review materials in April.	2.2. Mini-assessments (2) Teacher constructed tests

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

Reformatting of Biology IFC and development of focus lessons	9/10 Biology	Department chair	Biology instructors	Meeting each Friday	Monitoring of IFC and progress made to assure all benchmarks are appropriately addressed; checking for delivery of focus lessons in all Biology classes	Department chair Department administrator
Training in new Common Core Standards for incorporation of reading and writing literacy into science curriculum	All science	Department chair	Science PLC	PLC 1/10, 2/21	Monitoring of IFC and lesson plans for inclusion of literacy into science lessons	Department chair Department administrator
Construction of EOC format, higher-level questions	9/10 Biology	Department chair	Science PLC	PLC dates 9/6, 10/4 and 11/1	Monitoring of Biology test construction on all assessments used by teachers.	Department chair Department administrator
Lesson study for Biology instructors	9/10 Biology	Department chair	Biology instructors	3/school year	Monitoring of lesson study implementation and follow up colloquia.	Department chair Department administrator

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student prep and review for Biology EOC	Test Prep USA Biology EOC software site license	SAC	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
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: $300.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2012, 84 percent (384) of students met proficiency (level 3) or higher in writing.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 84 percent (384) of students met proficiency (level 3) or higher in writing.	In 2013, 87 (396) percent of students will meet proficiency (level 3) or higher 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	1a.1. Students have not mastered pre-writing skills. Most students are not able to formulate ideas and map out an outline for writing before they write. Also, students are not familiar with the six traits which is a key component to success.	1a 1. All students will produce a diagnostic expository and persuasive essay in Sept and will be given feedback and opportunity to revise. Students will produce additional essays, incuding those required by the DOE. 1a 2. All teachers will receive instruction on how to use FCAT 2012 exemplar rubric and use these in holistic scoring and in classroom instruction (including peer review). Teachers will also receive training on changes for FCAT 2012, including increased emphasis on elaboration and conventions. 1a.3. All students who score 4 or below will receive remediation and revise essays and encouraged to attend FCAT Camp. 1a 4.Students needing Level 2 RtI remediation following differentiated instruction in class will receive remedial instruction in small group pullout sessions using 6 traits strategies and FCAT 2012 scoring rubrics.	1a.1. Department Chair, Writing Coach	1a.1. Lesson Study	1a.1. FCAT six traits rubric CWT's FCAT Writing scores PSAT scores ACT scores PERT writing scores Web-based assessment programs Per and teacher reviews

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:	100 percent (4 students) scored at level 4 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 out of 4 students (100 percent) passed the FAA with a 4 or higher	In 2013, 100 percent of the students(4 students) will pass the FAA with 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	1b.1. Students have trouble with recognizing grammatical errors 1b.2. Students have not mastered pre-writing skills. Most students are not able to formulate ideas and map out an outline for writing before they write. Also, students are not familiar with the six traits which is a key component to success. 1b.3. Students lack the sufficient vocabulary to elaborate on ideas	1b.2. Teachers will use mini lessons and model how to proofread for grammatical errors such as sentence fragments, independent and dependent clauses, direct and indirect objects, verbs, action verbs, linking verbs, subject-verb agreement, etc. 1b.3. Students will learn a word of the day and focus on the 500 most commonly used SAT words. Students will study the Latin and Greek root words including prefixes and suffixes to better understand advanced vocabulary words.	1b.2. Writing Coach Assistant Principal, Department Chair	1b.3. Formative and summative assessments Bell ringers Writing folders Daily Journals	1b.3. FCAT six traits rubric FCAT Writing scores PSAT scores ACT scores PERT writing scores Web-based assessment programs Per and teacher reviews

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
Aligning common core standards to the Sunshine state standards.	9-12	Dept. Chair County experts, Reading coach	English/Language Arts teachers	Early release days	Administrator	English Dept. Chair

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pre-writing and drafting skills	Journals for all 9th and 10th grade students	SAC committee	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

PLC's to incorporate the CCstandards	Websites and copied materials	SAC	$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: $1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	By June 2013, 40% of 11th grade students in the non-AP US history courses will achieve a proficiency level on the US EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	40%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The scope and amount of content that needs to be covered before the testing date in late April/ early May. 1.2. The students lack of familiarity with analyzing documents, charts and political cartoons. 1.3. Students comfort level testing on the computer under a time limit.	1.1. Teachers will strictly follow the IFC and pacing guides provided by the district. 1.2. Teachers will expose students to primary documents, use analysis practices and share best practices with the Advanced Placement teacher. 1.3. Use of computers for administration of quizzes and tests throughout the year.	1.1. Department Chair	1.1. Progress Chats between the Department Head and the 2 US History teachers. Collaborative planning as part of the Social Studies PLC. 1.2. Teachers will utilize the Document Based Question (DBQ) format used in the Advanced Placement course quarterly. 1.3. Monitor classroom assessments during school time computer based quiz or test.	1.1.Check progress on the district made midterm that will emulate the state EOC. 1.2. Monitor of students understanding of document analysis. 1.3. Students will take a sample or practice test prior to the EOC under the direction of their teacher.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
PLC-Collaboration	11/US History	PLC Leader	Social Studies PLC	9-6, 10-4,3-14, 4-4	Monitoring of IFC and Pacing and collaborative planning.	Department Chair and US History teachers
PLC-Documents and Primary Resources	11/US History	PLC Leader	Social Studies PLC	9-6, 10-4,3-14, 4-4	Best Practices from all Social studies AP teachers on using and analyzing documents and primary resources.	Department Chair and US History teachers
PLC- Local and State History	11/US History	PLC Leader	Social Studies PLC	9-6, 10-4,3-14, 4-4	Working collaboratively as a department and with the Fort Lauderdale Historical society.	Department Chair and US History teachers

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:	By June 2013, the Stranhan student body will have an attendance rate of 95%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.0	95.0
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
418	400
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
22	20

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. Economic hardship, transportation, lack of parental guidance/involvement.	.1. Students will be rewarded with positive attendance. Recognition and motivational rewards based classrooms. Students will be recognized with awards, incentives, and newsletter recognition.	.1. RTI coordinator and RTI Leadership Team	. System will be set up through teacher daily attendance. Attendance data will be pulled to determine participation of students. Frequency of the use of the awards based system.	1.1. Attendance patterns, data, student involvement awards, and administrative referral.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	By June 2013, the total number of suspensions Stranahan students will have decreased by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
975	878
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

473	426
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
51	46
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
48	43

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Anticipated barriers decreasing the number of suspension include common violations of classroom rules and code of conduct, anger management issues, and insubordination.	1.1. Decrease the number of suspension include common violations of classroom rules and code of conduct, anger management issues, and insubordination.	RTI Leadership Team and RTI Team. ESE Specialist, Academy Coordinators	Through the RTI implementing in locating excessive suspensions, addressing with the use of behavior techniques, the amount of suspensions overall will decrease.	Suspension rate data, RTI implementation of strategies.
2		1.2. In order to decrease the number of suspensions throughout the school year, alternative programs and teacher behavior training will be implemented. Alternative programs, such as RTI implementation will be followed through by the RTI Leadership Team. Effective strategies will be implemented in order to locate excessive suspensions from specific students. Through the use of behavior techniques implemented through RTI, suspensions will be addressed.			
3		1.3 Student incentive plans - student of the week, academy student recognition awards (quarterly)			

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	To decrease the total number of students who drop out of Stranahan High School.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
15%	10%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

85.0%	90%

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. Anticipated barriers course failure, lack of credit attainment, and behavioral issues influencing student achievement.	1.1. Credit Recovery will be available to students who are not meeting credit requirements. Students will be career counseled with opportunities that will help them keep on the track of graduation.	1.1. Guidance Counselors and Administration Designee	1.1. Guidance and Administrative Designee will disaggregate data about low level and under credit requirement students.	1.1. Mentoring Program and data pulled from teachers about their small groups
2	1.2. Anticipated barriers course failure, lack of credit attainment, and behavioral issues affecting student achievement.	1.2. A specific student-mentoring program will enable teachers to mentor a small group (about five students) that are part of the lower quartile. Teachers will implement strategies and career counseling in a small group atmosphere.	1.2. Mentoring Program Participants	1.2. Through the Mentoring Program, teachers will be able to track and assist their small groups within the areas of achievement gains and credit requirements.	1.2. Mentoring Program and data pulled from teachers about their small groups

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	To provide materials and training to assist parents with their children to improve their children's academic achievement, such as literary training and using technology, as appropriate, to foster parental involvement.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
35% (1700)	45% (1700)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Expand the number of students who ultimately pursue advanced degrees and careers in STEM fields and broaden the participation of women and minorities in those fields.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Being able to provide opportunities in STEM to a large number of students 1.2. Being able to provide opportunities in STEM to a large number of students	1.1. Provide access to STEM courses for all students: in school or virtual/online. 1.2. Promote participation in formal STEM courses in high school: advanced and honors coursework 6-12, and AP courses. 1.3. Promote student involvement in STEM clubs, events and organizations: SECME, Science Fair, Math & Science Competitions	1.1. School administration Guidance	1.1. Course enrollment changes	1.1. Course enrollment

	1.3. Lack of opportunity for application of curriculum				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Portfolio Notebooks	Office supplies	SAC	$100.00
Writing	Pre-writing and drafting skills	Journals for all 9th and 10th grade students	SAC committee	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $1,100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Geometry EOC	Scientific Calculators	Carl Perkins	$1,350.00
Science	Student prep and review for Biology EOC	Test Prep USA Biology EOC software site license	SAC	$300.00
				Subtotal: $1,650.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Advanced Placement Calculus	Registration, materials & resources for AP Calculus	SAC	$500.00
Writing	PLC's to incorporate the CCstandards	Websites and copied materials	SAC	$0.00
				Subtotal: $500.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $3,250.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

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
1.Writing Journals for Pre-Writing and Drafting Skills 2.Portfolio Notebooks for Math 3.Test Prep Software for Biology End of Course Exams	$1,400.00

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

As the governing body over the School Improvement Plan (SIP) SAC's main responsibility for the 2012-2013 school year will be overseeing the fidelity of the plans set forth in the SIP and the departmental instructional focus calendars. In addition SAC will but is not limited to undertaking the following initiatives:

- Innovation Zone Parent University which will be aimed at educating parents about various district, tools and programs

- Reports from monitors of AYP subgroup in reference to progress, data collection and analysis, and departmental instructional focus changes based on data analysis,

-Departmental reports of SIP implementation, data updates, action plan adjustments or modifications.

-State and district reports and updates that have an impact on education.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
STRANAHAN HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	41%	75%	84%	39%	239	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	45%	74%			119	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)	58% (YES)			99	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					457	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
STRANAHAN HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	43%	74%	90%	37%	244	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	48%	73%			121	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?	36% (NO)	56% (YES)			92	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					457	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested