

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: AMI KIDS OF GREATER FORT LAUDERDALE

District Name: Broward

Principal: David Watkins

SAC Chair: Renee Hudson/Nerissa Lester

Superintendent: Robert Runsie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	David Watkins	Professional Certificate Educational Leadership K-12 and Social Sciences 5-9 Ed.S. Educational Leadership M.A. Social Studies Education	2	9	2010-2011: Reading Learning Gains (BASI): 48% (35) Math Learning Gains (BASI): 58% (43) AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Reading. No Subgroups made AYP in Math 2009-2010 (Stranahan High School Reading Mastery: 43% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 37% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: No Subgroups made AYP in Reading. No Subgroups made AYP in Math 2008-2009 Grade: Not Rated Reading Mastery: 10% Math Mastery: 25% Science Mastery: 0 % Writing Mastery: 68% AYP: No subgroups met AYP for Reading and Math.
Assis Principal	Sharon Grant	M.A. Educational Leadership (K-12) Guidance (K-12) English (6-12)	2	12	2010-2011 Grade: N/A 2009-2010 Grade: C (Piper) 08/09 performance- Piper HS grade was "C" with a score of 454. AYP status was NO- 72% of criteria met

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	Mary Shaw	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education; Masters in Education; Certified in ESE K-12 Gifted and ELO Reading Certified	11	6	2010-2011: Reading Learning Gains (BAS1): 48% (35) Math Learning Gains (BAS1): 58% (43) AYP: No subgroups met AYP for Reading. 2009-2010 Reading Mastery: 13% AYP: No subgroups met AYP for Reading. 2008-2009 Reading Mastery: 15% AYP: No subgroups met AYP for Reading. 2007-2008 Reading Mastery: 4% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Reading.
Math	Renee Hudson	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology; Masters in Curriculum and Instruction; Certified in Mathematic 5-9 and 6-12	6	3	2010-2011: Math Learning Gains (BAS1): 58% (35) AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Math 2009-2010 Grade: Not Rated Math Mastery: 19% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Math 2008-2009 Math Mastery: 25% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Math 2007-2008 Math Mastery: 6% AYP: There were no subgroups that made AYP in Math
Science	Lotoya Joseph-Brown	Bachelors of Arts in Marketing Masters of Science in Science Education; Certification: Science 5-9 and Mathematics 5-9	1	1	New to AMIkids
Reading	Gladymir Veillard	Master of Science in Reading (K-12) Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education (K-6) with ESOL Endorsement Certified English (6-12)	1	1	New to AMIkids

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. New Educator Support System – Instructional personnel new to teaching or new to Whiddon-Rogers and DJJ programs participate in this induction program facilitated on a monthly basis. In addition to the competency overviews, instructional staff is provided resources that will assist them as they acclimate to the alternative school model. They resources on high yield strategies, ESE and ESOL strategies, and working with low performing students. Mentors or provided and meet with their mentee weekly.	Sydney Culver	May 2012	
2	2. Professional Learning Communities (8 Days) – The professional learning communities are held monthly. The PLC's are determined based on the instructional needs assessments, AYP data, and the needs of student.	Sydney Culver	May 2012	
3	3. DJJ Programs facilitate weekly collaborative meetings to discuss students, instructional best practices, and teacher concerns.	DJJ Team Leader	Ongoing	
4	1. AMIkids GFL is looking to hire all HIGHLY qualified teachers for all subject matters. The teachers that are currently teaching are required to become highly qualified in their area in order to retain employment with AMIkids GFL	Luis Ceruti Michelle Miller	Jan 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Kristen Collins	Ms. Collins has registered for the Reading Endorsement class and has begun class.
Cheryl Barr	Ms. Barr is currently preparing to take the Math 6-12 Test.

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
4	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

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
Mary Shaw	Kristen Collins	Effective Reading strategies while Ms. Collins goes through the Reading Endorsement.	Extensive Collaboration
Deidre Whack	Cheryl Barr	Mentor Ms. Cheryl through the ESE planning and instruction	Extensive Collaboration

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Part D funds are used to employ an Educational Assistant, who provides various assessments to GFL students. Additional duties for the EA include maintaining student's educational files. Supplemental educational resources, i.e. instructional support materials, ESE support personnel, and tutors will be accessed to provide support for ESE and non-ESE students whose assessment data indicate additional assistance is needed.

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Within 15 program days of enrollment, each student meets with the Director of Education to review prior academic information and academic assessments given upon entry (i.e. BASI, Career Assessment Inventory, Choices Interest Profiler), take the TED writing assessment & Learning Styles Inventory, and create their long-term academic goal (graduation option) and projected transition date from the program. The student's career goals and interests are also discussed at this time, as well as her Major Area of Interest is selected. Additional academic planning takes place daily in regular classes with the student's teachers and also on a weekly basis with the youth's Advisor during homeroom. Furthermore, each student has the opportunity to schedule a separate meeting with the Director of Education to discuss pertinent academic and career information. Academic and career planning for each student is also reviewed and discussed during Treatment Team Reviews by staff on a monthly basis.

Job Training

Employability skills, wellness, nutrition, team and self-esteem building, personal hygiene, and good sportsmanship is all strongly emphasized within this course. Careers that would encompass all of the above-mentioned topics are highlighted in this course. Additionally, GFL is a Ready-To-Work site where students work toward credentials online at the school site.

Other

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI leadership team will be comprised of the assistant principals, department head/team leaders, select instructional personnel, the ESE specialist, the ESE support facilitator, guidance personnel, the transition specialist, and the RtI case manager, and designated instructional personnel.

Team Members:

Mark Howard, Assistant Principal
Kendra Nichols, Guidance Director
Mary Shaw, Reading Coach
Renee Hudson, Math Coach
Derrick Meyers, Director of Education
Eric Gervin, ESE Support Facilitator
Theresa Taylor, Transition Specialist
Cheryl Barr, Teacher
Cassandra Ward, Teacher
Michael Drummer, Teacher
Thecia Sankar, Teacher
Ross Pierre, Director of Behavior Modification
Parents/Guardians/Child Advocates

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 case manager and education director will co-facilitate bi-weekly meetings to discuss students based on the tiered level. Based on the level of intervention, the case manager and education director will facilitate meetings to share student data, which will include baseline/diagnostic and progress monitoring data derived from research based resources. This data will be utilized to make recommendations to increase interventions, determine tiers, and address instructional gaps. The RTI team will consist of members from the SAC, literacy team, treatment team and collaboration of off-site DJJ personnel. They will work collaboratively to address student academic needs.

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

The RtI leadership team will work collaboratively to develop, implement, facilitate, and monitor the school improvement plan. Members of the RtI team will participate on the SAC team. Specifically, they will be responsible for diagnosing and prescribing interventions based on the frequent monitoring of baseline and progress monitoring data. The RtI team will be included on the SAC agendas and will provide monthly RtI reports and recommendations. Monthly meetings will be utilized to determine needs and effectiveness of plan. Modifications will be made on an as needed basis.

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.

Data sources will be the BAT, FORF, BASI, formative assessment, end chapter tests, in addition to the research-based diagnostic, which will provide baseline data with opportunities to track progress throughout the school year. Additional data will be accessed via Virtual Counselor, Data Warehouse, and the school reports menu located on the Broward Schools network. Student data will be tracked utilizing the RtI spreadsheet.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Members of the RtI team will be in-serviced during pre-planning week and throughout the 2010-2011 school year, as specific needs arise. Topics will include CHAMP's, CAR-PD, and other district and area related trainings/workshops.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mary Shaw (DJJ Reading Coach), Olga Wilson (Reading Coach); David Watkins, Principal; Sharon Grant, Assistant Principal DJJ; Deidra Whack, ESE Specialist; ; Carrie Palmer, Reading Teacher; Lynne Roback, Reading Teacher; Paul Tyson, Reading Teacher; Susan Shechter, ESOL Reading Teacher; Susan Nash, Reading Teacher; Belinda Smith, ESOL Coordinator; Renee Hudson, Math Coach/Department Head; John Braker, Social Studies Teacher; Katie Moncrief, Science Coach/Department Head; Sydney Culver, English Department; Mitch Heater, Reading Teacher; Debra Trohatos-Rosenberg, Media Specialist; Regina Turner, Science Teacher; Beatrice Simmons, ESE support facilitator; Gayle Holland, Vocational Department Head; Michelle Miller: Director of Education, & Cherryl Barr: ESE support facilitator.

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

The LLT meets twice a month. LLT functions to identify and collaborate on school-wide staff development, departmental staff development, as well as student lessons and activities to increase students learning capacity, reading skills and improve academic achievement. The RtI will work collaboratively with the LLT to address student needs based on frequent review and monitoring of student data.

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

The major initiative is to ensure that school-wide staff development needs are met, across the curriculum, to increase student learning as well as academic achievement. For example, the Professional Development Days (PDD) and Professional Learning Community (PLC) focus will be Vocabulary Development and Technology to increase classroom rigor and student achievement in Reading. Additionally, recommendations for the implementation of school related reading initiatives and programs will take place during these meetings. Additionally, the resumption of D.E.A.R. will be a topic of discussion, as it was eliminated when instructional staff were lost during last year's budget cuts. Other subject specific interventions will be discussed, these initiatives will be monitored by the education director and evaluated using the number of sessions conducted and the number of students who participate and demonstrate gains.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All instructional staff, including the center's Educational Assistant will be seeking there reading endorsement during the 2012-2013 school year, starting with CAR-PD. Classrooms walk through's will be conducted by the education director, assistant principal, and RTI team to ensure strategies are being implemented in all classrooms.

*High Schools Only

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

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

The Reading Coaches and PLC Facilitators will coach, model, and monitor all instructional staff to implement reading and writing instruction across the curriculum providing professional development and daily support using CRISS and/or MCREL learning strategies, through the use of reading journals, reading logs, summarizing, note-taking, graphic organizers, student writing assignments, activities, and projects. Administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of IFC's and assessments.

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?

Instruction will infuse interdisciplinary units that will incorporate project-based learning for the purpose of connecting realworld lessons. Master schedule incorporates courses that afford the opportunity to knowledge of career and vocational opportunities. Students in grades 7-9, will have a develop ePEP and all students complete a vocational interest inventory with subsequent career/vocational selections using CHOICES and FACTS.ORG.

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](#)

Whiddon-Rogers has instituted a full-time elective class for ACT prep, which will boost graduation rates, assist with test-taking skills and remediate in math, reading and writing. Program staff, with the assistance of Title I's transition staff encourage participation in said testing and seek fee waivers for eligible students. Other transition activities are conducted throughout the school year, to include college tour at Florida Memorial University.

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:	Students will be appropriately placed in accordance to the middle and high school reading plan.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Average GE is approx 5.8 ant intake and 5.4 at post assessment. This is a loss of -0.5 Average GSV is 581 at intake with a -32.2 at post assessment. This is a 32.2 loss	Average GE will likely remain the same at 5.4 average post test of intake. The expected level performance is an average post test of 7.4

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	1.1. Limited Vocabulary Limited abilities to read grade level fluency Limited ability to comprehend grade level text	.1. Students will have an intense AIP written from the outcomes of the STAR assessment. The students will work on the goals noted by the areas for improvement. Students are encouraged to move up their program rank with improvement in test scores and other areas of the program. Thus taking the test more serious.	Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant Reading Coach Mary Shaw Reading Coach Gladymir Veillard Science Coach Lotoya Joseph-Brown	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and Fair data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions accordingly. Progress monitoring the DAR word list and FORF (fluency probe). Edge Unit Clusters Benchmark assessments. Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered.	1.1. 2012 FCAT, STAR, BAT Assessment, FAIR Assessment Mini Assessment, Formal and informal test Teacher made tests and EDGE Cluster benchmark assessments Full DAR for ESE students, DAR word list, and Florida Oral reading fluency probe (FORF)
2	Students limited abilities to read grade level text fluently	Teaching the process of reading, emphasizing instructor demonstrated intonation.	Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant Reading Coach Mary Shaw Reading Coach Gladymir Veillard Science Coach Lotoya Joseph-Brown Michelle Miller-Education Director	Classroom walkthroughs	FORF/DAR data Classroom Wakthrough
	Students limited abilities to use strategies to comprehend grade level text.	Intensive Academic plans in which the teacher has access to the students' performance on STAR. This allows for individual	Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant	Data Chat Review Review STAR, FCAT and Fair data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students and	1.1. 2012 FCAT, STAR, BAT Assessment, FAIR Assessment Mini Assessment,

3		instruction	adjusting instructions accordingly.	Formal and informal test
		Reading Coach Mary Shaw		Teacher made tests and EDGE
		Reading Coach Gladymir Veillard		Cluster benchmark assessments
		Science Coach Lotoya Joseph-Brown		Full DAR for ESE students, DAR word list, and Florida Oral reading fluency probe (FORF
		Michelle Miller-Education Director		

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increasing student level of performance on the FCAT Reading by providing rigorous instruction to support students performing at or above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Average GE is approx 5.8 ant intake and 5.4 at post assessment. This is a loss of -0.5 Average GSV is 581 at intake with a -32.2 at post assessment. This is a 32.2 loss	Average GE will likely remain the same at 5.4 average post test of intake. The expected level performance is an average post test of 7.4

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
Limited Vocabulary Limited abilities to read grade level fluency Limited ability to comprehend grade level text	1.1. Students will have an intense AIP written from the outcomes of the STAR assessment. The students will work on the goals noted by the areas for improvement.	1.1. Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant Reading Coach	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and Fair data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions accordingly.	1.1. 2012 FCAT, STAR, BAT Assessment, FAIR Assessment Mini Assessment, Formal and informal test

1		Students are encouraged to move up their program rank with improvement in test scores and other areas of the program. Thus taking the test more serious.	Mary Shaw Reading Coach Gladymir Veillard Science Coach Lotoya Joseph-Brown Michelle Miller - Education Director	Progress monitoring the DAR word list and FORF (fluency probe). Edge Unit Clusters Benchmark assessments. Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered.	Teacher made tests and EDGE Cluster benchmark assessments Full DAR for ESE students, DAR word list, and Florida Oral reading fluency probe (FORF)
---	--	--	--	--	---

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		In grades 6-12, twenty-one percent of students tested will demonstrate a learning gain.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
19% (2/11 students)		21% (3/11 students)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of engagement among students performing below proficiency	Provide opportunities to access technology resources via computer labs	Derrick Meyers, Michael Drummer, Mary Shaw	Classroom Walk Through (CWT)	CWT's & Student Surveys
2	Lack of reading support in content areas.	Align reading instructional focus calendar to content area classes.	Derrick Meyers, Michael Drummer, Mary Shaw	Conducting CWT's Student-teacher data chats Teacher feedback	BAT'S Mini- Bats CWT's

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Students in lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2/4)	75% (3/4)

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	Lack of integrating culturally diverse materials into curriculum	Utilize district approved resources to enhance culturally diverse classroom library	Mary Shaw, Coach Reading Teachers Derrick Meyers, DOE	CWT's	CWT's Student Surveys

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

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

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:	Students performing below proficiency will be reduced by 8%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	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	Teachers effectively utilizing accommodations to address learner needs as documented on IAP	Content teachers will individualize their instruction to the students strengths, i.e. learning style.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education; Mary Shaw, Coach; Michael Drummer, Reading Teacher	Class walk throughs	BASI assessments, mini assessment (BEEP), BAT 1& 2, and FORF/DAR

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Students performing below proficiency will be reduced by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

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	Teachers effectively utilizing accommodations to address learner needs.	Content teachers will receive support from the ESE specialist and ESE support facilitator to provide assistance to students in SWD subgroup.	Mary Shaw, Coach Jeaneane Chiffone, ESE Specialist Eric Gervin, ESE Support	CWT	assessments, mini assessment, BAT, FORF/DAR

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:	Students will reduce below proficiency performance by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

No data available			No data available		
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	Teachers effectively utilizing accommodations to address learner needs.	Content teachers will receive support from the ESE specialist and ESE support facilitator to provide assistance to students in SWD subgroup.	Mary Shaw, Coach Jeaneane Chiffone, ESE Specialist Eric Gervin, ESE Support	CWT	assessments, mini assessment, BAT, FORF/DAR

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:	Students will reduce below proficiency performance by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data available	No data available

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of access to technology.	Students will be provided with bi-weekly access to technology via the computer lab.	Mary Shaw & Derrick Meyers	Computer logs	CWT Sign-In logs.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Endorsement	6 -12	Mary Shaw	Kristen Collins	Enrolled should e complete by June 2013	Weekly meetings will help with Ms. Kristen to get the status of her class	Michelle Miller Mary Shaw

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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	
CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

Middle School Mathematics 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Teach and review concepts outlined in the NGSSS to increase student achievement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (3/19)	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	Students struggling with basic concepts which lead to lack of motivation.	Integrate differentiated instruction using the 8-Step Instructional Process and Marzano's High Yield Strategies. Make connections to use of terms in everyday application and language. Infused IFC (Instructional Focus Calendar) to support direct instruction.	Renee Hudson, Coach; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher	Classroom Walk Through (CWT's), Lesson plans, discussions during Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings	BEEP Mini assessment, BAT 1 & 2, Lesson Plans
2	Lack of student awareness on academic progress.	Utilize common planning opportunities to create and review facilitation and implementation of high order questioning techniques.	Renee Hudson, Math Coach; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher	Data Collection, Monitor CWT's, Discussion during PLC meetings	CWT's, Data Chats, Lesson plans, Exams

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

No Data Submitted

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Students will participate in daily instructional activities that are aligned with the IFC and next generation sunshine state standards.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	5% (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	Lack of enrichment opportunities for students performing above proficiency.	The Math Teacher will follow the instructional focus calendar and timelines.	Renee Hudson, Math Coach; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher	Weekly CWT's, IFC's, AMI kids Trip Plans.	CWT's, Mini assessment (BEEP) BAT 1& 2, Exams

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Students in lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

78% (7/9)		88% (8/9)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of understanding basic applications.	Teachers will model skill application and scaffold learning Teachers will participate in professional development in the area of scaffolding instruction.	Renee Hudson, Math Coach; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher	WT's Fidelity Checks	CWT's, Quiz and Exams

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Students in lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (7/9)	88% (8/9)

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
	Inconsistent	The math teacher will	Renee Hudson,	Weekly CWT's IFC's	CWT's Mini

1	implementation of the instructional focus calendar.	follow the instructional focus calendar and time-lines.	Coach; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education.	assessments (BEEP), BAT 1 & 2, Exams
---	---	---	--	--------------------------------------

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%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal #				
		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Students in AYP group will reduce non-proficient performance by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data	No data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students feel sense of frustration due to lack of academic success.	Teachers will utilized differentiated learning strategies to effective engage learners. Professional development opportunities will be provided for instructional staff to assist students experiencing frustration. Utilize chunking methodology to increase student success.	Renee Hudson, Coach; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher; Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	PLC's meeting discussions, CWT's	BAT 1 & 2, Mini Assessments (BEEP), CWT's
2	Lack of technology resources available.	Students will have access to technology resources that will supplement and support learning of mathematical concepts.	Derrick Meyers, Director; Renee Hudson, Coach; Cheryl Barr, Math Teacher	CWT's, Computer lab useage, AMI trip plan, laptop sign-out requests	BAT 1 & 2, Mini Assessments, CWT's

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	
--	--

Mathematics Goal #5C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		Students will reduce below proficiency performance by 10%.			
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
16% (3/19)		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
	Students lack of access	Students will be	Renee Hudson,	Computer logs	CWT

1	to technology resources.	provided with bi-weekly access to technology via the computer lab.	Coach Math teacher		
---	--------------------------	--	--------------------	--	--

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:	will compare the STAR math assessments from 2012-2013 for gains of at least two grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The average GE for youth entering is 6.4. During the year there was no improvement in the GE. The youth remained the same, 6.4	The average GE upon entering will likely stay the same. However, the average GE gain will be 8.

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	Limited school success	1.1. Youth will have an intense AIP written from the outcomes of the STAR assessment. The youth will work on the goals noted by the areas for improvement. Youth are encouraged to move up their program rank with improvement in testing scores and other areas of the program. Thus taking the test more serious.	1.1. Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant All Teaching staff Michelle Miller Luis Ceruti Renee Hudson Math Coach	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and WIN data reports, to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions according. Benchmark assessments. Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered. Classroom walkthroughs	1.1. 2012 FCAT, STAR, , Formal and informal test Teacher made test
2	Lack of student awareness on academic progress	1.3. Intensive Academic plans in which the teacher has access to the students' performance on STAR. This allows for individual instruction	1.1. Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant All Teaching staff Michelle Miller Luis Ceruti Renee Hudson Math Coach	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and WIN data reports, to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions according. Benchmark assessments. Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered. Classroom walkthroughs	1.1. 2012 FCAT, STAR, , Formal and informal test Teacher made 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:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #1:

AMIkids Greater Ft. Lauderdale will compare the STAR math assessments from 2012-2013 for gains of at least two grade level.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

The average GE for youth entering is 6.4. During the year there was no improvement in the GE. The youth remained the same, 6.4

The average GE upon entering will likely stay the same. However, the average GE gain will be 8.4

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	Limited school success	Youth will have an intense AIP written from the outcomes of the STAR assessment. The youth will work on the goals noted by the areas for improvement. Youth are encouraged to move up their program rank with improvement in testing scores and other areas of the program. Thus taking the test more serious.	1.1. Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant All Teaching staff Michelle Miller Luis Ceruti	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and WIN data reports, to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions according. Benchmark assessments. Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered. Classroom walkthroughs	1.3 .2012 FCAT, STAR, Formal and informal test Teacher made 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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on 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 :

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

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
Algebra Goal #3B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
Algebra Goal #3C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.
Algebra Goal #3D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Limited school success	1.1. Youth will have an intense AIP written from the outcomes of the STAR assessment. The	1 Principal David Watkins Assistant Principal Sharon Grant	1.1. Review STAR, FCAT and data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instructions	1.1.2012 FCAT, STAR, Assessment Mini Assessment, Formal and informal test

1	<p>youth will work on the goals noted by the areas for improvement.</p> <p>Youth are encouraged to move up their program rank with improvement in testing scores and other areas of the program. Thus taking the test more serious.</p>	<p>Renee Hudson Math Coach</p> <p>Michelle Miller</p> <p>Luis Ceruti</p>	<p>according.</p> <p>Progress monitoring</p> <p>Bi-weekly mini assessments District Benchmark will be administered.</p> <p>Classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>Teacher made test and Custer benchmark assessment</p>
---	---	--	---	--

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

<p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</p> <p>Geometry Goal #2:</p>	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

<p>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Geometry Goal #</p> <p>3A : <input type="text"/></p>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p> <p>Geometry Goal #3B:</p>	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	
---	--

Geometry Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of 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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science 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 science. Science Goal #1a:	Teacher will provide standards based instruction to increase student knowledge of science principles by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/3)	33% (1/3)

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	Lack of scaffolded standards based instruction to support student knowledge of scientific concepts.	Address all benchmarks utilizing a science instructional focus calendar weekly.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	Classroom observations Lesson Plans Weekly communication with instructors	CWT Science FCAT
2	Students need reinforcement of standards being taught throughout the science curriculum.	Scientific thinking will be infused throughout lesson delivery. Teachers will develop test questions aligned to test item specifications.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	Classroom observations Lesson Plans Weekly communication with instructors	CWT Science 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:		Students above proficiency will increase by 5%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (0/3)		33% (1/3)			
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	Students lack participation in hands on activities.	Students will participate in hands-on enrichment to connect learning and relate scientific thinking.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	Classroom observations, Lesson Plans, Weekly communication with instructors.	CWT Lesson plans Lab reports

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 science. Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Given evidenced based writing strategies, students will demonstrate growth in 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (2/14)	20% (3/14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Retaining learned writing strategies.	Explicit instruction in all content area courses in order for students to become successful writers in all subject areas.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	Weekly writing prompts, CWT, IFC, Data Chats	Writing prompt w/ Rubric, BASI
2	Lack of motivation.	Teacher will teach with approaches that foster critical thinking skills, questioning, student decisionmaking, and independent learning.	Derrick Meyers, Director of Education	Weekly writing prompts, CWT, IFC	Writing prompt w/ Rubric, BASI, and number of student completed assignments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics 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 Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics 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 Civics Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.				
U.S. History Goal # 1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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		To ensure daily attendance of all assigned students.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
75.01125		80.00			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
45		35			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
23		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	Many students assigned/court ordered to attend AMI kids: GFL will continue to defy authority figures, law enforcement, and their Judges and refuse to attend school daily.	Provide an environment that is conducive to students resuming daily attendance at school.	AMI kids: GFL program staff, Department of Juvenile Justice Probation Officers (JPO's), and parents/guardians/child advocates.	Documented daily attendance of the program	Attendance records

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance 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:	AMI kids: Greater Fort Lauderdale does not suspend students, as this is a court-ordered program for youth adjudicated to the program.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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:				
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>				
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:		
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement		Parent Involvement in school-based activities at AMI kids: Greater Fort Lauderdale is encouraged by the program's faculty and staff, especially for IEP meetings, student transition, graduations, and exit meetings. Staff will be available to discuss school news, updates, and student progress. In addition, an open house will be provided on a bi-annual basis.			
Parent Involvement Goal #1:					
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
100% (71)		100% (71)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students attend a DJJ day treatment program that operates during the typical workday.	Each student is assigned an advisor, who arranges for monthly site or home visits. Student progress will be discussed during either; more detailed discussion can be arranged for during said visit.	Director of Education Director of Case Management Student Advisor	Completion of Home/Site visit form documenting the gist of the visit.	Parent survey Student survey Feedback during transition meeting.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

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
No Data Found
No Data Found