

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: COOPER CITY HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Wendy Doll

SAC Chair: Janessa Puig and Juanita Farmer

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/2012

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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	Wendy Doll	MA Guidance k-12 MA Educational Leadership	16	16	2011-2012 Cooper City High, Grade Unknown 2010-2011 Cooper City High, A, did not make AYP 87% 2009-2010 Cooper City High, A, did not make AYP 97% 2008-2009 Cooper City High, Grade B, did not make AYP 90% 2007-2008 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP 95%
Assis Principal	JulieBiancardi	BA, Social Science Certification in Education/Educational Leadership Assigned to: Social Studies	3	18	2011-2012 Cooper City High, Grade Unknown 2010-2011 Cooper City High, Grade A did not make AYP 87 % 2009-2010 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP 97% 2008-2009 McArthur High, Grade C, did not make AYP 2007-2008 McArthur High, Grade D, did not make AYP
		BA English Literature BS Science			2011-2012 Cooper City High, Grade Unknown

Assis Principal	GregoryPluim	EDS Educational Leadership Educational Leadership Assigned to: Science World Languages Media and ESE	4	11	2010-2011 Cooper City High, did not make AYP 87% 2009-2010 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP 97% 2008-2009 Cooper City High, Grade B, did not make AYP 2006-2008 Sea Castle Elementary, Grade B, did not make AYP
Assis Principal	Ann Rocco	BS, Mathematics MS, Mathematics Educational Leadership Assigned to: Mathematics	18	6	2011-2012 Cooper City High, Grade Unknown 2010-2011 Cooper City High, did not make AYP 87% 2009-2010 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP 97% 2008-2009 Cooper City High, Grade B, did not make AYP 2007-2008 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP
Assis Principal	Anthony Valachovic	Assigned to Language Arts and Reading	7	9	2011-2012- Hollywood Hills HS, Grade Unknown 2010-2011- Hollywood Hills HS, Grade C, did not make AYP 72% 2009-2010 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP 97% 2008-2009 Cooper City High, Grade B, did not make AYP 2007-2008 Cooper City High, Grade A, did not make AYP

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	Darilyn Brown	MA Political Science Reading K-12 Certificate Social Science 6-12 Certificate ESOL Endorsement	9	7	Students Meeting High Standards in Reading: Grade 9: 2008-69%, 2009-63%, 2010-70% 2011-67% Students Meeting High Standards in Reading: Grade 10: 2008-57%, 2009-55%, 2010-63% 2011-58, 2012 Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains Data: 2012-2011-66% in 9th and 10th grade. 2011-2010- 51% in 9th and 10th grade. 2010-2009- 54% in 9th and 10th grade.

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. Recruit instructional staff with multiple certification areas.	Wendy Doll	Throughout school year as positions become vacant.	
2	2. Monitor highly qualified completion status for ESE aides and instructional staff.	Ann Rocco	Throughout school year, with a completion date of June 30, 2013.	
3	3. New Educator Support Staff (NESS) Program	Beverly Davis	Monthly through June 7, 2013.	
4	4. Collegial Mentorship	Department Heads and Lead Teachers.	Daily through June 7, 2013.	
5	5. Staff Development – CHAMPS and "One Voice" discipline.	Julie Biancardi	Monthly through	

			June 7, 2013.	
6	6. Staff Development – Common Core and NGSSS transition.	Administration and Faculty.	Monthly through June 7, 2013.	
7	7. Teacher incentives-certificates, acknowledgements, and thank you notes.	Administration	Monthly through June 7, 2013.	
8	8. Highly qualified instructional staff scheduled with ELL students.	Darilyn Brown	August 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
Latravis Bernard, ESE Access English, Geometry, Science (SPVE) Donna Dietz, ESE Access English, Earth Space Science Cynthia Herrera, Reading class Dennis Maugere, Law Studies David Mervos, Government	Take Subject Area Test Take Subject Area Test Complete Reading Practicum course Take Subject Area Test-not HQ Take Subject Area Test-not HQ

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
99	4.0%(4)	9.1%(9)	48.5%(48)	38.4%(38)	49.5%(49)	92.9%(92)	5.1%(5)	7.1%(7)	88.9%(88)

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
Darilyn Brown(Reading Coaches)	Cynthia Herrera	To ensure that reading teachers utilize the proper reading strategies in their classrooms. Reading teachers will teach and assist content area teachers in implementing reading strategies in their lessons.	Reading teachers and select content area teachers meet with Reading Coach and Department Heads to develop integrated reading strategies in the content area trainings, common assessments, and peer mentoring.
	First year		

Beverly Davis-NESS Program	teachers-At Cooper City High: David Black Scott Gerschutz Cynthia Herrera Sharlene Melendez Lisa Jones	To ensure success for first year teachers.	First year teachers will be paired with a NESS coach. The coach will acclimate the teacher to school policies and procedures through monthly meetings, resource development, and peer collaboration.
Jill Beer -ESE Specialist Claudia Jones, ESE Support Facilitator Donna Dietz, ESE Support Facilitator Heid Dermer, ESE Support Facilitator			
Linda Coel- Math Dept. Head	David Black - SS Lee Gerschutz- MA Cynthia Herrera - Rdg	Teachers new to CCHS	Peer mentoring that introduces school practices and policies. Development of lesson plans. Peer training and collaboration of program processes.
Juanita Farmer- Science Dept. Head			
Sharon Friedlander- Guidance Director Darilyn Brown- Reading Coach Sally McNeal- Social studies DH	Sharlene Melendez- SC Lisa Jones- LA		
Apryl West- English Dept. Head			

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

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title I school.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title I school.

Title I, Part D

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title I school.

Title II

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title II school.

Title III

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title III school.

Title X- Homeless

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School does not have a homeless shelter in our boundaries.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

All SAI funds are utilized to fund a percentage of the teachers who work with the low performing (bottom 25% in Math and Reading) and ESE/ESOL students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Anti-Bullying and Silence Hurts campaigns are initiated school wide, through the assistance and effort of the Prevention Designee.

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition instruction is offered both through the HOPE and Physical Education programs.

Housing Programs

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title I school.

Head Start

Not Applicable – Cooper City High School is not a Title I school.

Adult Education

Cooper City High School coordinates with Cooper City Community School to provide students with a non-traditional placement where relevant.

Career and Technical Education

Vocational programs provide students with the opportunity to earn professional certification in technical areas of expertise. Programs on-site; Drafting, Engineering, Child Care, Auto Technology, Web Design, and the Academy of Finance, Multi-Media Design.

Job Training

Partnership efforts and curriculum alignment is coordinated through Carl Perkins Grant money and the CTACE department to provide students the opportunity for internships within the Academy of Finance, and Child Care, and other technical/vocational program which are linked to graduation credits. The PASS Program provides opportunity's for employment skills and life skills for the ESE population.

Other

Partnerships efforts are coordinated through Cooper City High School and the school PIE committee who work together to gain support of local businesses. Over 30 partnerships have been fully developed.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Response to Intervention Team:

Case Managers:

School Principal- Wendy Doll

Coordinator of the Team, Guidance Director, Meeting Facilitator- Sharon Friedlander

ESE Specialist- Jill Beer

Social Worker- Eileen Nessman-Stern

School Psychologist- Lisa Spencer

ESE Behaviorist- Jennifer Bluth

Reading Coach - Darilyn Brown

Speech Therapist- Cathy Esposito

Response to Instruction Team:

Department Heads

Administrative Team

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 CPST Team, Department Heads, Administration meet bi-monthly to 1) develop effective educational strategies that support teaching and learning, 2) analyze data and identify those students who are not proficient or making progress in reading, math, science, and writing and 3) make recommendations to CPST staff that will assist them in using research-based strategies that improves performance. Tier I extends opportunities for all children to make progress while Tier II focuses on those children who are struggling in select areas. When it is determined that little progress is being made after individual

interventions, teachers may refer students to the Response to Intervention Team (RTI/CPST).

The CPST Team consists of the principal, guidance director, social worker, reading coach, ESE specialist, speech pathologist and school psychologist who meet bi-monthly to examine and propose prescribed interventions to improve academic and social behaviors that may be barriers to selected students learning. Teachers, administration, counselors and parents may refer to CPST. After an analysis of attendance, behavior and academic data, the team may assign mentors to support these students (approximately 25 per year). Mentors meet with the students, contact parents, and report to the CPST liaison to ensure these children are making every effort to improve their learning environment and progress towards graduation. Select Reading teacher's students have been identified as critical this year. Select population followed for the second year. Student returned from OCLC and foster care. Students returning from Be Right Back and Foster Care are monitored.

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 problem-solving processes involve meetings that analyze attendance, behavior and academic data as well as anecdotes from the assigned mentors. If it is determined that the student is in need of social services, in addition to tutoring, mentoring, and connectedness, the social worker is then assigned to support the emotional needs of the student and even the physical and emotional needs of the family. It is the role of the CPST to ensure that students who are referred for more intense interventions receive the support that is required to make progress in all academic areas. Research supports that poor grades and poor attendance may be the result of a dysfunctional family dynamic beyond what occurs in the classroom. Thus, CPST is designed to reach across the school boundaries to support students in their goal to graduate from high school.

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 and organizational methods include but are not limited to BASIS, Pinnacle, Virtual Counselor, and Data Warehouse Reports. The administrator over each department uses these tools to collaborate monthly with staff in order to analyze test data from the BAT, mini-assessments, chapter tests and quizzes to determine strengths and weaknesses for each grade level/each department and initiate early intervention.

TIER I FLOW-CHART:

Classroom behavior and performance expectations are created. Depending if they are met or not met the following takes place:

Teacher-documented interventions to improve behaviors of struggling students (Tier I). For example, differentiated teaching and learning strategies, parent contact, and individual conferences.

Referral to CPST: Minimal response to interventions (Tier II).

TIER II and III CPST PROCESS (1st and 3rd Tuesday of each month)

Meet with CPST members to review what intervention strategies have been implemented -- successfully and unsuccessfully. Counselor to meet with student to discuss teacher concerns and assignment of a mentor.

Assign a CPST liaison.

*Expectations: Parent contact, student conferences, assistance to other teachers, and peer tutoring when appropriate.

Set up clear expectations for parents and students.

Document parent and student contact.

Evaluate strategies that work.

Document progress.

Require bi-monthly teacher monitoring and monthly CPST liaison meetings

Participate in final evaluation:

*No evidence of progress (meeting to recommend ESE testing or to find other school alternatives).

*Evidence of progress (share with teachers, counselors and administrators for continued support). We piloted an at-risk struggling reader group that each week had instructional strategies, support teacher and counselor.

RTI:

Includes one 10th grade at risk reading groups for Tier II- III intervention.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained on the Response to Intervention Plans during planning periods and on the following staff development training days: October 26.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Implementation will be monitored through administration and follow-ups. Additionally, at these meetings the Reading Coach will model effective instructional reading strategies. The meeting facilitator will administer the BENCHMARK CHECKLIST to determine CPST teacher-knowledge, and will focus professional development on the greatest gaps.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team is composed of:

Principal, Wendy Doll

Guidance Director/CPST facilitator-Sharon Friedlander

ESE Specialist-Jill Beer

Assistant Principals:

Ann Rocco- Math, Business, Industrial, FCS

Gregory Pluim-Science, World Languages and ESE

Julie Biancardi-Social Studies, Fine Arts, P.E.

Anthony Valachovic- Language Arts and Reading

Content Area Department Heads:

English-April West

Reading-Darilyn Brown

Math-Linda Coel

Science-Juanita Farmer

Business-Brian Snider

Technology and Media- Brian Kelly

Social Studies-Sally McNeal

Fine Arts-Janessa Puig

Vocational-Dan Sorrentino

Physical Education-Frank Dellapace

World Languages-Debra Mensinger

ESE-Nicole Hicks

Family and Consumer Sciences-Joyce Braman

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team will meet bi-monthly. Literacy goals will be developed using outcome assessment data from each department. Professional Development will be initiated for staff, based around needs assessment. The effectiveness and fidelity of implementation will be assessed through progress monitoring of data.

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

The Literacy Team will focus on the infusion of common core standards through reading and writing across the content areas, development of text complexity and evidenced based writing. Common Core Thematic Units are being created for content area courses through departments. Teachers of the same course, through collegial planning are developing, 4 units for the school year. Each unit aligns writing common core grade level appropriate reading, writing, listening, and speaking standards. These units include but are not limited to: the administration of common assessments, the instruction of content objectives, the infusion of course specific prefix/suffix/root plan, direct vocabulary, differentiated instruction, and implementation of common rubrics.

Piloting a World History/World Lit 10 and Amer History/Amer Lit team (both teachers have the same students) to focus on integrating common core standards and evidenced based writing.

On going efforts from previous years---Vocabulary Development-teachers have already been trained in Direct Vocabulary Instruction and Word Walls. Vocabulary development will expand to include content area vocabulary, and P/S/R for grades 9-12.

Also a School-wide implementation of reading and writing comprehension strategies and

"higher order thinking" during instruction and common assessments are the focus of staff development training.

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.

Cooper City High School is a secondary institution.

*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 will be given on going staff development on text complexity and appropriate reading strategies by the reading coach and evidenced based writing by department heads and AP teachers during department meetings, planning periods and Early Release days and curriculum council
Implementation and results will be monitored through data collection, lesson plans and conferencing. This plan is aligned with the State of Florida K-12 reading goals and verified through the RTI and LLT collaborative integration process.

*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?

Guidance counselors will develop a better system for monitoring the CTE non-completers.
Through guided activities counselors address the importance of students achieving their potential to keep options open for the future.

Guidance staff provides students with information that promotes meaningful course selections, technical expertise, and real-world choices for options in and beyond high school.

At least one credit of technical or performing arts is required for graduation. However, 3 credits in one vocational area of interest may earn a student a college scholarship. Through e-pep (electronic portfolio) students plan their 4 years based upon their goals and interests. Counselors explore options with all students through group and individual meetings to determine educational plans beyond high school and how high school courses support those plans. For students who show a penchant for technical coursework, counselors encourage them to share time at Sheridan Technical Center.

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?

E-pep and CHOICES through facts.org provide students with the tools to discover their talents as well as their strengths. Students access these programs through guidance lessons and classroom activities with the counselors and the teachers working collaboratively.

By identifying their career options and their educational choices, they can build upon their strengths and strengthen their weaknesses. Courses at the high school and at the local technical schools can offer those students who wish to pursue real world occupations with training and placement.

Counselors meet with every student one-on-one to discuss future plans which include course selections for the upcoming school year, high school and college requirements and our involvement in dual enrollment courses with Broward College, and career exploration, career awareness. Through E-pep and registration meetings, counselors, parents and students plan together to ensure that our students graduate with options for the future.

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](#)

College Readiness- related data thru 2012.

*Data demonstrates that the number of students receiving the maximum Bright Futures award has maintained at a level of at least 300 from 2007-2012.

- * Data demonstrates that the number of students enrolling in 2 and four year colleges was 95% in 2011 - 2012.
- * A college planning night for parents and students in grades 9-12 informs our parents and students how to navigate the steps to help their student meet or exceed their future goals and aspirations.
- * Students will revisit their high school and post secondary planner to ensure they are selecting courses that will not only meet high school graduation requirements but also are consistent with their career choices.
- * Data demonstrates that students at Cooper City High School perform above the district's average on the SAT and ACT.
- * Students in grades 11 and 12 are informed and encouraged to register for the SAT, ACT or PERT to determine their college readiness and the necessary steps they need to take to be prepared for education at the next level.
- * Teachers are provided with copies of the PSAT practice tests, ACT and SAT practice tests, and PERT practice tests to work with their students to improve their opportunities to score well on college readiness tests.
- * Through the UPPER LEVEL LIKELY and AP Potential reports, students are registered for the most rigorous courses that their abilities indicate, i.e. AP and honors.
- * In 2012-2013 the top 10th grade scores on the 2011 PSAT have been invited to participate in a class sponsored by our Partner in Education, Broward Tutorial to increase the number of NMSQT in 2013 from 6 to 10.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 79% of the 9th and 10th graders will be proficient in reading. 3 % of current level 1 and/or 2 students will increase their achievement to a level 3 proficiency in reading as measured by FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (301/1072) of 9th and 10th graders are proficient level 3 in reading.	There will be a 3% increase of students achieving a level 3 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers need assistance in the development and delivery of reading infused lessons as well as the creation of a department P/S/R plan and implementation of the new standards.	Staff development-to continue the alignment of instruction with Content Area and Language Arts/Reading Standards. Reading Learning Community to conduct collegial conversations, Best Practices, teacher reflections, and study groups. Staff Development in Reading Infused Lesson Design.	Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Reading Coach AP Teachers.	Lesson plans. Administration/Teacher/Student data chats. Teacher evaluations. Student work. Teacher/Student Data Chats. Progress monitoring of students in the bubble.	FAIR , Mini-assessment and chapter tests. Reading Infusion Content Area Quizzes/ Tests
2	Teacher-training needed for blending of NGSS to CCS.	Staff Development.	Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Department Chairs, Department Facilitators and department mentors.	Lesson plans. Student work. Administration/Teacher data chats. Teacher/Student Data Chats. Progress monitoring of common assessments to include increased rigor and question complexity as part of the school-wide content area reading and writing infusion plan.	FCAT score FAIR Common Assessments.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	By June 2013, 40% of students taking the FAA will score at level 4,5,or 6. 10 % of current level 1, 2 or 3students will increase their achievement.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

30% (3/10) of students who took the FAA scored level 4, 5, 6 in reading.	There will be a 10% increase of students scoring at level 4, 5 and 6.
--	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	Not all teachers and Education Support Personnel (ESP) are trained in reading curriculums for complex learners.	In-School trainings and district Access points training for teachers.	ESE department head.	Student observations of small reading groups.	Florida Alternate Assessment practice test.
3	Freshmen students are not familiar with High school standards and procedures.	Structured teaching strategies.	Classroom teachers and ESE department head.	Progress monitoring of teacher implementation and students gains will be reviewed monthly using data chats. Lesson plans. Student work. Teacher observations of student. Task analysis.	Assessments.
4	It's difficult to properly assess students in the 10th grade for learning gains in reading, writing, and math. Students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment in the 9th grade do not take it in the 10th grade.	Train teachers to follow up students in the 10th grade with similar assessment's that monitor student progress in reading, writing, and math.	ESE department head.	Lesson Plans and student work.	Assessments.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 45 % of the 9th and 10th graders will achieve a level 4 or 5 in reading. 3 % of current level 2 and 3 students will increase their achievement to a level 4 or 5 proficiency in reading as measured by FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (486/1104) of 9th and 10th graders are proficient level 4 or 5 in reading.	By June 2013 there will be a 3% increase of 9th and 10th graders will achieving a level 4 or 5 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers are not trained in incorporating evidence based writing in content area lessons.	PLC through AP vertical teaming.	Reading Coach, Department Chairs, Assistant Principals, and Teachers.	Professional learning community will collaborate on the development of a rubric to evaluate student progress.	Evidence based rubric.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By June 2013, 70% of students taking the FAA will score at level 7 or above. 10 % of current level 4,5, or 6 students will increase their achievement .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (6/10) of students who took the FAA scored at or above a level 7.	There will be a 10% increase of student scoring at or above a level 7 in the FAA.

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	Higher number of more complex learners.	Train teachers to better utilize differentiated instruction strategies within the classroom setting.	ESE department head.	Student Work	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 74% of the 9th and 10th graders will make learning gains in reading. There will be a 5% increase in learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69.9 % (717/1027) of student made learning gains in reading.	Learning gains will increase by 5 %.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student's comprehension is hindered by the limited vocabulary.	Department development of content area specific vocabulary including a Prefix/Suffix/Root Plan. School wide infusion on direct vocabulary instruction.	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach. Department Chairs, facilitators, and mentors.	Student work. Lesson plans.	Chapter Test, Mini Assessments. FAIR
2	Teacher-training is needed informational text reading and writing strategies.	PLC	Assistant Principals. Reading Coach, Department Chairs. Department Facilitators and Course Lead Teachers.	Lesson plans. Student work. Administration/Teacher data chats. Teacher/Student Data Chats.	Chapter Test, Mini Assessments. FAIR
3	Freshmen with a limited understanding of reading strategies, test-taking and study skills.	Reading Coach will provide a ninth grade initiative to implement reading, test taking, and study strategies. Reading Coach will provide any other needed assistance	Assistant Principals, Reading Coach. Department heads, classroom teachers.	Progress monitoring of teacher implementation and students gains will be reviewed monthly using data chats. Lesson plans. Student work.	Assessments.

			Teacher observations of student gains.
--	--	--	--

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	By June 2013, 90 % of the students taking the FAA will make learning gains in reading. There will be a 10% increase in learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (8/10) students made learning gains in reading in the FAA.	There will be a 10% increase of students making learning gains in the FAA.

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	Higher number of more complex learners.	Train teachers to better utilize differentiated instruction strategies within the classroom setting.	ESE department head.	Student Work	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Based on 2010-2011 FCAT 51% (135/263) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. This was a 3% decrease from the 2009-2010 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (135/263) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 54% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading. 3% of the current 9th and 10th grade students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate positive learning gains in reading as measured by FCAT.

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	Lowest 25% of Cooper City High includes students who are level 3's and not in reading classes.	Continue to identify and locate these fragile 3's to ensure they are being serviced through the ninth grade initiative and a tenth grade push-in program. Quantify data on these students to determine if additional mentoring is needed. Coaching assistance provided to teachers with these students.	Assistant Principals, Guidance, CPST, Reading Coach, Teachers and Reading Teachers.	Administrator/Teacher data chats. Teacher/Student data chats. At Risk Students assigned to Assistant Principal. Review of mini assessments and tests in Pinnacle by Assistant principals. Reading Strategies mini assessment reviewed	Mini assessments Tests, and Graduation Rate.

		Select students are placed in appropriate reading classes.		weekly by Reading Coach. Bi-Monthly Reading Department Meetings. Encourage attendance at FCAT Camp.	
2	Teacher-training needed for blending of NGSS to CCS.	Staff Development.	Assistant Principals. Reading Coach, Department Chairs, Department Facilitators and department mentors.	Lesson plans. Student work. Administration/Teacher data chats. Teacher/Student Data Chats. Progress monitoring of common assessments to include increased rigor and question complexity as part of the school-wide content area reading and writing infusion plan.	FCAT score FAIR Common Assessments.

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 # 75% of ninth graders and tenth graders are levels 3 and 4 in reading. By 2017, 15 % of ninth and tenth graders will increase their proficiency to a level 3.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	75%	78%	81%	84%	87%	

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, 72% of the students in the Hispanic subgroup will make learning gains in reading. There will be a 3 % decrease in students not making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 22% (130/572)Hispanic: 31%(108/339).	White: 18%,4% decrease.Hispanic: 28%,3% decrease.

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	English Language aquisition.	ESOL Program. Peer Buddy Ssystem/strategies. District materials	ESOL Contact. Classroom teacher.	FCAT BAT 2 Reading strategies, Mini Assessments.	FCAT IPT II CELLA Course Assessments.
2	Vocabulary Development.	ESOL Program. District materials	ESOL Contact. Classroom teacher.	FCAT Reading strategies, Mini Assessments. IPT II two times per	FCAT IPT II CELLA Course Assessments.

				year.	
3	Special Needs students of all of the ethnicities.	District materials, ESE programs.	ESE support facilitators, ESE specialists, Assistant principal.	Lessons and student work. Data chats.	FCAT, FAIR

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:	
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 reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, 37 % of students in the SWD subgroup will make learning gains in reading. There will be a 2% decrease in students not making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (74/113) of the SWD subgroup did not make learning gains in reading.	There will be a 2% decrease in students not making progress

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	Teacher-training needed for blending of NGSS to CCS.	Staff Development.	Assistant Principals. Reading Coach, Department Chairs, Department Facilitators and department mentors.	Lesson plans. Student work. Administration/Teacher data chats. Teacher/Student Data Chats. Progress monitoring of common assessments to include increased rigor and question complexity as part of the school-wide content area reading and writing infusion.	FCAT score FAIR Common Assessments.
	Students with disabilities come from all levels of ability.	Identify and locate these students to provide academic support and	Classroom Teachers.	Teacher/Student Data Chats quarterly.	Mini-Assessments, quizzes, chapter tests, term exams

2	mentoring through push-in, pullout, tutoring, and mentorships. Reading Teachers modeling for content area teachers.	ESE Support Facilitators.	Progress monitoring of common assessments to include increased rigor and question complexity as part of the school-wide content area reading and writing infusion plan.
---	--	---------------------------	---

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, 60 % of students in the Economically Disadvantage subgroup will make learning gains in reading. There will be a 3 % decrease in students not making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% 123/286 of Economically Disadvantage students did not make learning gains in reading.	There will be a 3% decrease of Economically Disadvantage students not making progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Economically Disadvantaged Students come from all levels of ability.	Identify and locate these students to provide academic support and mentoring through push-in, pullout, tutoring, and mentorships. Reading Teachers modeling for content area teachers.	Assistant Principals. Classroom Teachers.	Department Chairs monitoring. Teacher/Student Data Chats quarterly.	Mini-Assessments, quizzes, chapter tests, term exams

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
SAT/ACT Vocabulary Plan. Build academic vocabulary; focus strategically on pivotal and commonly found words across the disciplines.	School-wide.	Department Chair Assistant Principals	Teachers	County wide early release days and teacher planning, Ongoing development and monitoring.	Monitor use and misuse of academic vocabulary within and across disciplines.	Department Heads, Assistar Principals
Prepare students for						

college and career readiness through cloze reading and rereading of complex texts.	School-wide	Teachers Reading Coach, Department Chair	Teachers	Pre Planning, County wide early release days and teacher planning, Ongoing development and monitoring.	Cloze reading strategy instruction and sharing of best practices.	Department Heads, Assistar Principals
Additional Career and College reading, writing, NGSSS and CC readiness.	School – wide	Reading Coach	Teachers	Additional staff development voluntary training as needed to review CRISS, HOTS, strategies, review data collection.	Review of thematic unit success.	Department Heads, Assistar Principals
Career and College reading and writing readiness.	School-wide	Reading Coach Department Chairs and selected facilitators	Teachers	County wide early release days and teacher planning, Ongoing development and monitoring.	Develop rubrics for thematic assesment reading and writing components to monitor student success.	Department Heads, Assistar Principals
NGSSS-CCS	School-wide	Administrator over Professional Development Reading Coach	Teachers Department Chairs	County wide early release days and teacher planning, ongoing.	Development and implementation of Thematic Units across the content areas. Evaluation of teaching and re-teaching as needed.	Administration, Department Heads.
Response to intervention.	School-wide	CPST Team	Guidance Director, Guidance Counselor CPST members. Teachers ESE Support Facilitators	County wide early release days and teacher planning, ongoing development.	Student progress reports and CPST Monthly Meeting	Guidance Direct Principal CPST Members
Reading-Differentiated Instructional techniques revisited.	All content areas in Grades 9-12	Reading Coach Department Chairs and selected facilitators	Teachers	County wide early release days and teacher planning, Ongoing development and monitoring.	Lesson plans developed to meet the diverse needs of all learners.	Reading Coach, Assistant Principals
Departmental Prefix/Suffix/ Root word vocabulary Plan.	School-wide	Reading Coach, Department Chair	Teachers	Initial training, follow-up, and implementation. Department meetings.	Reading Coach and Department Heads Monitor use and misuse of commonly found words with in and across disciplines.	Reading Coach, Department Heads , Assista Principals

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
Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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:			3% increase for students in each grade level in grades 9-12 will be proficient in the listening and speaking skills.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
9th grade 50% 6/12 10th grade 72% 13/18 11th grade 61% 11/18 12th grade 100% 12/12					
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 need assistance in differentiated instruction for LY students.	Staff development.	Assistant Principal ESOL Contact Teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals.	Quarterly Progress Checks	IPT II CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:			3% increase in students in each grade level will be proficient in reading.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
9th grade- 15% 2/12 10th grade- 37% 7/18 11th grade- 44% 8/18 12th grade 50% 6/12					
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 lacking LA materials for LY students below C1 classification.	Use of district materials available ESOL contact resources	Assistant Principal ESOL Contact Teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals	Quarterly Progress Checks	IPT II CELLA
2	CCHS Literacy Plan towards CCS, text complexity, and evidence based writing.	Use of district materials available ESOL contact resources	Assistant Principal ESOL Contact Teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals	Quarterly Progress Checks	IPT II CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

3% increase for of students in each grade level will be proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

9th grade- 25% 3/12
 10th grade- 32% 6/18
 11th grade- 39% 7/18
 12th grade- 42% 5/12

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	CCHS Literacy Plan towards CCS, text complexity, and evidence based writing.	Use of district materials available ESOL contact resources	Assistant Principal ESOL Contact Teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals	Quarterly Progress Checks	IPT II CELLA
2	Teachers lacking LA materials for LY students below C1 classification.	Use of district materials available ESOL contact resources	Assistant Principal ESOL Contact Teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals	Quarterly Progress Checks	IPT II CELLA

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, 80% of the students who take the FAA will score at a level 4,5,or 6 in Math. There will be a 10% increase in learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (7/10) of students scored at a level 4, 5, 6 in the FAA in Math.	There will be a 10% increase in students scoring level 4,5,or 6 in the FAA.

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	Not all teachers and Education Support Personnel (ESP) are trained in math curriculum for complex learners.	In-School and district training for teachers and ESP.	ESE department head.	Student observations of small math groups.	Florida Alternate Assessment practice test.
2	Freshmen students are not familiar with High school standards and procedures.	Structured teaching strategies. Use of manipulative and real world applications.	Classroom teachers and ESE department head.	Progress monitoring of teacher implementation and students gains will be reviewed monthly using data chats. Lesson plans. Student work. Teacher observations of student. Task analysis.	Assessments.

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	By June 2013,we will maintain the number of students at or above a level 7 in the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (2/10) students who took the FAA scored at or above a level 7 in mathematics	Maintain.

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
	Higher number of more complex learners.	Train teachers to better utilize	ESE department head.	Student work.	Florida Alternate Assessment

1		differentiated instruction strategies within the classroom setting.		Practice 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:	By June 2012, there will be a 10% increase of students making learning gains in the FAA math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (6/10) of students made learning gains in math.	70% of students will make learning gains. There will be a 10% increase.

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	Higher number of more complex learners.	Train teachers to better utilize differentiated instruction strategies within the classroom setting.	ESE department head.	Student work and documented teacher observation.	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice Test.

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, 39% of students taking the Algebra EOC will achieve a level 3. 2% of current level 1 and 2 students will increase their achievement to a level 3 proficiency in Algebra as measured by Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (200/532) of students achieved a level 3 in Algebra.	There will be a 2% increase in algebra.

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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drills. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies	Post-test. Summative results from 2012.

2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.
---	---	--	--	---	---

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, 45% of students taking the Algebra EOC will achieve a level 4 or 5. 2% of current level 2 and 3 students will increase their achievement to a level 4 or 5 proficiency in Algebra as measured by Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43%(228/532) of students achieved a level 4 or 5 in Algebra.	There will be a 2 % increase.

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	Algebra EOC; lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPAT computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPAT implementation. Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.

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 # 81% of students are proficient in Algebra. 90% of students will be proficient in algebra by 2017. Every year there will be a 2% increase of students from level 1 and 2 to a level 3 or higher.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%	

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
1	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drills. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies	Post-test. Summative results from 2012.
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.

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, 64% of the ELL students will make satisfactor progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% or 3/8 ELL did not make satisfactory progress in Algebra.	There will be a 2% decrease of students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.

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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills. Lack of familiarity with Algebraic vocabulary.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drills. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math. ESOL contact.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies	Post-test. Summative results from 2012.
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.

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, 41% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (37/65) did not make satisfactory progress.	There will be a 2% decrease.

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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drills. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math. ESE support facilitators.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies	Post-test. Summative results from 2012.
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.

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, 74% of the ED students will make satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (44/154) of economically disadvantaged students did not make progress in Algebra.	There will be a 2% decrease of students not making progress in Algebra.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this group tend to have less knowledge of technology and related skills.	Students will be made aware of all resources available at school and the hours they are available. Teachers will encourage the use of the school media center and	Math Department Chair and Assistant Principal over Math dept.	Attendance at tutoring sessions, usage of media and classroom technology, usage of online practice. FOCUS.	Mini-assessments, EOC.

technology before and after school and tutoring done through Mu Alpha Theta and Honor Society.

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:	By June 2013, 39 % of students taking the Geometry EOC will maintain a level 3 or raise to a level 3. 2 % of current level 1 and 2 will raise their proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (194/523) students scored a level 3 in Geometry.	There will be a 2% increase of level 1 and 2 students achieving level 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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drill. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies	Post-test. Attendance at PM tutorials to monitor increased motivation. Summative results from 2012
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Geometry EOC.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Quarter Exams. EOC Exam.

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, 45% of students taking the Geometry EOC will achieve a level 4 or 5. 2% of current level 2 and 3 students will increase their achievement to a level 4 or 5 proficiency in Geometry as measured by Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (226/523) of students scored at or above levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	There will be a 2% increase.

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	Geometry EOC; lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for the EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Math 9-12 Next Generation State Standards. Utilize EPat computer based training for Geometry EOC.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure Epat implementation. Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Quarter Exams. EOC Exam.

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 # By June 2013, 82% of students taking Geometry EOC will be proficient as measured by the Geometry EOC.			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	82%	84%	86%	88%	

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, 84% of white students and 86% of Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 18% (53/280) Hispanic: 16% (27/168)	White: There will be a 2% decrease. Hispanic: There will be a 2% decrease.

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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drill. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies.	Post-test. Attendance at PM tutorials to monitor increased motivation. Summative results from 2012.
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Quarter Exams. EOC Exam.

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, 84 % of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (2/11) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	2% Decrease in the number of student's not making progress.

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	Motivation and weakness with basic skills. Lack of familiarity with Geometric vocabulary.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs. Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drill. Recognition.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies.	Post-test. Attendance at PM tutorials to monitor increased motivation. Summative results from 2012.
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment.	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Geometry EOC.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Quarter Exams. EOC Exam.

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, 53 % of SWD students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (25/51) did not make satisfactory progress on the geometry EOC.	2% decrease in the number of students not making progress.

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
	Motivation and weakness with basic skills.	Teacher utilization of Virtual Counselor for data-driven instructional needs.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Review formative and summative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made	Post-test. Summative results from 2012

1		Quarterly Data Chats. Basic skills drills. Recognition.	ESE support facilitators.	and adjust intervention as needed. Observations to ensure consistency. PLC meetings to adjust strategies.	
2	Lack of familiarity with computer based assessment .	Implementation of instructional focus calendar pacing for Algebra EOC that will address indicated benchmarks and Common Core Standards Utilize EPat computer based training for Algebra.	Math Department Chair. Assistant Principal for Math.	Classroom observations to ensure EPat. Implementation. Horizontal Lesson Planning. Teacher evaluation.	BEEP Benchmark Mini Assessments. District Summative Exams. 2012 Algebra EOC Exam.

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, 75 % of ED students will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (38/138) of Economically Disadvantage students did not make progress in Geometry.	There will be a 2% decrease in Economically Disadvantage students not making progress in Geometry.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this group tend to have less knowledge of technology and related skills.	Students will be made aware of all resources available at school and the hours they are available. Teachers will encourage the use of the school media center and technology before and after school and tutoring done through Mu Alpha Theta and Honor Society.	Math Department Chair and Assistant Principal over Math department.	Attendance at tutoring sessions, usage of media and classroom technology, usage of online practice. FOCUS.	Mini-assessments, EOC.

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
Digital Classroom Training	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair	9-12 grade Math teachers	Ongoing	Observation	Math Dept Chair, Assistant Principal over Math

Student Data Chats	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair	9th-12th grade Math teachers.	Monthly Dept. meetings, Early Release, teacher planning days.	Student Data Chat sheets, schedules.	Math Dept. Chair, Assistant Principal over Math.
Unwrapping the Benchmarks/Core Curriculum	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair	9-12 Math teachers.	Monthly Dept. meetings, Early Release.	Staff Development Calendar, Instructional Focus Calendar.	Math Dept. Chair and Assistant Principal over Math dept.
Differentiated Instructional	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair	9-12 Math teachers.	Monthly Dept. meetings, Early	Mini-assessments, lesson plans	Math Dept. Chair and Assistant Principal
Differentiated Instructional	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair	9-12 Math teachers.	Monthly Dept. meetings, Early	Mini-assessments, lesson plans	Math Dept. Chair and Assistant Principal
Common Assessments	9th-12th Math	Mathematics Department Chair. Technology specialist.	9th-12th grade Math teachers	Monthly Dept. meetings, Early Release, teacher planning days.	Lesson plans and assessments Curricular notebooks	Math Dept. Chair and Assistant Principal over Math dept.

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Algebra EOC and Geometry Remediation	After School/ Saturday Review	Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: \$1,500.00

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:	Maintain the level of student performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (4/4)	Maintain

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 lack familiarity with standard based curriculum (access points) in the area of Science.	District Access Points training.	ESE department Head.	Students work in the area of Science.	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice 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 science. Science Goal #2:	By June 2013, 10% of students taking the FAA in Science will improve to a level 7 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/4)	10% improvement.

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	Total number of Complex learners.	District Access Points training. Increase hands on activities for science and experiments.	ESE department Head.	Student's work in the area of Science. Documented teacher assessments/ observation.	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice Test.

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, 80% students taking the Biology EOC will achieve a Level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (126/485) scored a level 3 in Biology.	There will be a 3% increase in students achieving a level 3 in Biology.

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

1	Students are unprepared for increased rigor of the Biology EOC standards.	Teachers will increase the use of study skills and note taking strategies. Teacher will use thematic units to increase vocabulary, reading comprehension, and content knowledge.	Science Department Head and Department AP.	Unit assessments. Thematic Unit Rubric.	Biology EOC.
---	---	---	--	--	--------------

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:			By June 2013, 54% of Students scoring at or above a level 4 and 5 in Biology will continue onto an honors/AP level science course.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
51% (246/485) students scored a level 4 or 5 in Biology.			There will be a 3% increase of students reaching a level 4 or 5 in Biology.		
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 need more strategies for enrichment in the content area, review of EOC criteria and reading strategies to promote interest in science areas.	Teachers need more strategies for enrichment in the content area, review of EOC criteria and reading strategies to promote interest in science areas.	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach and Science Department Head.	EOC mini and unit assessment. Teacher student data chats. Thematic Unit Rubric.	Including Biology EOC. Class schedules for the upcoming year.
2	Students have difficulty with higher order thinking processes.	Student scientific inquiry projects will be assigned involving higher order thinking processes and projects will be presented. Students will be given guidelines and due dates to follow through the scientific	Science teachers and Science Research teacher	Develop rubric for effective research papers. Evaluate student progress.	Research Paper.

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
Science PLC-						

Collaboration of sharing of best practices concerning labs and the Scientific Thinking Process as related to the EOC and AP curriculum.	9th-12th	Science Department Chair	9-12 grade Science teachers	Beginning August 2012 and completion date of March 2013, monthly dept. meetings for science teachers and teacher planning days.	Science PLC Discussions, Collaboration of Best Practices, Student Assessment Data.	Science Dept Chair, Assistant Principal over Science.
Vocabulary Improvement. Strategies. Incorporation of Science prefixes and suffixes, higher level question techniques and alignments of assessments to instruct EOC and AP standards.	9th-12th	Science Department Chair, Reading Coach	9th-12th grade Science teachers.	Early Release, teacher planning days	Reading Coach will model VIS strategies and do follow up observations.	Science Dept Chair, Assistant Principal over Science.
In preparation for EOC all science teachers will participate in district sponsored PD to target strategies that develop critical thinking in abstract science processes. Science Data Chats.	9th-12th	County facilitators and Science Department Head.	9th - 12th Science department members.	TDA's, early release and teacher planning.	Debrief conducted at monthly team meetings.	Science AP, Dept. Chair, Registration takes place through ESS and points will be assigned accordingly.
Science Data Chats.	9th-12th	Science AP, Science Department Chair	9th - 12th Science department members.	Early Release Training, dept. meeting, pre-planning.	Data Chat Sheets, data chat schedule.	Science AP, Dept. Chair
Science Test Specifications.	Algebra/Geometry teachers.	Science AP, Department Chair	9th – 12th grade Science teachers.	Early Release Training, department meetings, pre-planning.	Lesson plans will utilize same language as test specs, mini assessments, end of chapter exams will be aligned within disciplines. Exams will be aligned with EOC and AP standards.	Science AP, Dept. Chair

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
Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,000.00

			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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 Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 96% of students will score a 3 or higher in writing. This will be a 5% increase across all levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (499/549) of students scored a 3 or higher in writing.	There will be a 5% increase in students achieving a 3.0 and higher in FCAT 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	Increase demands of FCAT 2.0 with emphasis on editing skills	Restructure 9th and 10th grade English curriculum emphasizing editing skill.	Curriculum leader. Language Arts Dept. Chair and Dept. Assistant Principals.	Practice prompts administered throughout the year are evaluated based on state distributed FCAT 2.0 anchor papers. Student data is gathered over the course of the semester ending in January. These scores are compared to student's practice prompt administered the day before FCAT Writes 2.0. Consistency between these scores is used to determine success.	FCAT Writes 2.0 anchor paper scores compared to teacher scores on practice prompts.
2	Complex learners lack basic understanding of writing conventions.	Teacher implements daily writing warm ups on the smart board.	Classroom teachers. Support facilitator	Student work.	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice 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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	100% (6/6) of students who took the FAA received a 4 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

100% (6/6) of students who took the FAA received a 4 or higher in writing.	By June 2013, 100% of the FAA students will receive a 4 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	Complex learners lack basic understanding of writing conventions.	Teacher implements daily writing warm ups on the smart board/white board. Utilize individualized daily writing.	Classroom teachers. Support facilitator.	Student work and documented teacher observation.	Florida Alternate Assessment Practice Test. Student writing samples.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Vocabulary Infusion.	9th-12th	Language Arts Department Chair and Language Arts Teachers.	9th-12th grade Language Arts Teachers.	Monthly Department Meetings, Early Release Training.	Word Walls, VIS graphic organizers.	Assistant Principal responsible for writing curriculum Department Chairs, English Teachers.
Writing Across the Curriculum.	9th-10th	Language Arts Department Chair and Assistant Principal responsible for writing curriculum.	9th and 10th grade teachers.	Teacher Early Release Day and Teacher Planning Days.	FCAT Writing Rubrics.	Assistant Principal responsible for writing curriculum Department Chairs, English Teachers.
State issued anchor papers and rubrics.	9th-10th	Language Arts Department Chair, Assistant Principals, Language Arts Teachers.	9th and 10th grade teachers.	Teacher Early Release Day and Teacher Planning Days.	FCAT Writing Rubrics.	Assistant Principal responsible for writing curriculum Department Chairs, English Teachers.

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
Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,500.00

End of Writing 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
			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 | Out of 2215 total students, 92.8% were present on any

Attendance Goal #1:	given day as indicated by the Data Warehouse report. By June 2013, there will be an increase of attendance by 2%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Out of 2215 total students, 92.3% were present on any given day as indicated by the Data Warehouse report.	By June, 2013 the attendance rate will improve by at least 2%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
317 students have excessive absences or 14% of total student population as indicated by the Data Warehouse report.	By June, 2013 the number of students with excessive absence will decrease 10% so that no more than 286 of students will have excessive absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
52 students have excessive tardies or 2% of total students.	By June, 2013 the number of students with excessive tardies will decrease 10%, no more than 42 students will have excessive tardies.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulties balancing part-time jobs and various challenges at home.	Guidance Counselors and the RTI team will review rates.	Guidance Director, Assistant Principals.	Monthly meeting agendas, attendance pulls from TERMS and Monthly Attendance Rates monitored by administration.	Student Attendance Rate Reports.
2	Students have various challenges at home. and encounter difficulty with make up work.	Affective Domain Referrals will be directed to school Guidance Counselor, Social Worker and Family Counselors.	School Guidance, Social Worker and Family Counselors.	Parent conferences.	Attendance Reports in the School Reports Menu.

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:	The total number of students suspended for the 2011-2012 school year was 456. This includes external suspensions, internal suspensions and AES suspensions for grades 9-12. Our goal is to decrease this number by 20% using proactive positive strategies and interventions in the classrooms.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 456 In-School Suspensions.	The goal is to decrease the number of students with In-School Suspensions 20%. By June 2013, no more than 364 students will be suspended in-school.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
There were 254 students suspended in school for the 2011-2012 School Year.	The goal is to decrease the number of students suspended by 10%. By June 2013, no more than 228 students will be suspended.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 218 external/out of school suspensions for the 2011-2012 School Year.	Expect to decrease by 5%. No more than 207 out of school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
There were 146 external/out of school suspensions for the 2011-2012 School Year.	Expect to decrease by 5%. No more than 138 students will be suspended.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Off task student behavior.	School wide progressive discipline plan with common expectations.	Administration and Guidance Counselors and RTI team.	Suspension rates for both ESE and General Education Students as well as using the referral reports located in the DWH discipline folder.	Suspension reports generated through the school reports menu.
2	100% of school staff implement and follow school wide positive behavior plan.	The professional development plan will include CHAMPS training, as well as other classroom management techniques.	Administrator for Professional Development.	Suspension rates for both ESE and General Education Students as well as using the referral reports located in the DWH discipline folder.	Suspension reports generated through the school reports menu.

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

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>	The total percent of dropout for grades 9-12 will decrease by .05% (1) using proactive and positive measures and interventions in the classrooms, guidance and administrative office.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
During the 2011-2012 school year .05% (1) students dropped out of school.	By June of 2013 we will reduce the drop out rate by .05% as indicated by student withdrawals.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
During the 2011-2012 school 99% of students graduated.	By June of 2013 we will increase the graduation to 100%.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Off task student behavior and corrective actions.	A positive behavior plan will be developed with teacher input that will outline corrective steps to reduce off task behavior and offer interventions to be implemented before reaching the referral step.	Administration and the RTI Team.	Referral rates to RTI team and success levels for maintaining student involvement.	Drop out and withdrawal data as collected by registrar.
2	Repeated off task student behavior which results in disenfranchised students.	Teacher will refer students to the RTI process based on criteria supplied by the RTI team.	Administration.	Referral rates for both ESE and General Education Students.	Discipline Referral reports generated through the school reports menu.

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
RTI Problem Solving	9th-12th	Guidance Director	Leadership Team	Monthly starting in August, 2012.	Minutes from meetings.	Guidance Director, Administration

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		In 2012-13 school year, web site/teacher website visits will increase by 3% by incorporating more student information on the web site and utilizing more effective communication through parent link.			
<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:			
In the 2011-2012 school year, there have been 204, 796 website visitors. There were 37,681 visitors on the teacher websites.		By June 2013, there will be a 3% increase of school web site hits.			
In the 2011-2012 school year there were 4,863 adult volunteer hours recorded.		By June 2013, there will be a 5% increase of school adult volunteer hours.			
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	Community and parents need to be more aware of school web site information.	Advertise school events and meetings through school web site and parent link.	School Web Site Webmaster.	Review of monthly hit rates on school web site.	School Web Site hit counter.
2	Parents may not have access to computers.	Give parents access to internet in school – guidance office.	Guidance Personnel.	Review of monthly hit rates on school web site.	School Web Site hit counter and school volunteer

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 student and teacher involvement in interdisciplinary programs. Need curricular personnel to assist school with promoting STEM initiatives Lack of technology and funds for students	Increase collaboration of teachers through technology and science	Science, Math and CTE teachers.	Monitor increase involvement in county sponsored STEM programs.	Science and Math competition attendance sheets.

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
Science Fair and Math competitions.	9-12 Science, Math and CTE	County STEM Coordinator	Science, Math and CTE Classroom Teachers	October 2012, December and January collaborative Meetings. Ongoing throughout the year.	Science, Math and CTE Competitions.	Department Heads and Administrators.

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
Science Technology Equipment		Accountability Funds	\$1,375.00
			Subtotal: \$1,375.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,375.00

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:	
<p>1. CTE</p> <p>CTE Goal #1:</p>	<p>By June 2013, there will be 50% increase in the number of students passing the industry certification exam in the select Career and Technical Education Courses.</p> <p>Web Design- 13/23 Auto 9 – 0/12 Drafting 3 – 0/13 Childcare 4 – 24/25 Integrated Manufacturing- 1/13</p> <p>By June 2013, the number of students taking an industry certification exam (i.e, Dreamweaver, Photoshop) will increase by 50%.</p>

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	<p>Students take career and technical courses, however there is a lack of alignment with the industry certification test and the framework.</p> <p>Also students do not understand the relevancy and benefit to becoming industry certified.</p>	<p>Preparation for the industry certification exam will be imbedded within the course.</p> <p>Select courses will remediate and enrich students prior to taking the Photoshop and Dreamweaver exams.</p> <p>Guidance counselors/teachers develop a better monitoring system to identify non-completers in select CTE courses. Teachers need to determine attrition for their select course and devise a retention strategy.</p> <p>Practice test results will be monitored.</p>	Career and Technical Education Teachers.	Percentage of students that pass the exam.	Certification Practice Tests State industry Certification Test

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
Industry Certification preparation.		Carl Perkins Grant	\$16,000.00
			Subtotal: \$16,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$16,000.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Algebra EOC and Geometry Remediation	After School/ Saturday Review	Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
				Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STEM	Science Technology Equipment		Accountability Funds	\$1,375.00
CTE	Industry Certification preparation.		Carl Perkins Grant	\$16,000.00
				Subtotal: \$17,375.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
Science	Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,000.00
Writing	Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$1,500.00
STEM	Professional Development		Accountability Funds	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$6,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FCAT CAMP		Accountability Fund	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,000.00
				Grand Total: \$27,875.00

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 (Uploaded on 10/22/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
----------------------------	--------

SAC accountability funds are used to satisfy professional development and student learning needs. Funds are utilized throughout the year as dictated by the SIP Plan.

\$11,875.00

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

The CCHS School Advisory Council, through monthly meetings , will create, monitor, and edit the SIP plan as needed throughout the school year. SAC will follow the proper guidelines to distribute A+ Funds (if available) and create school waivers (if needed).

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 COOPER CITY HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	93%	88%	51%	299	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	61%	77%			138	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	51% (YES)	82% (YES)			133	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					580	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District COOPER CITY HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	93%	95%	50%	308	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	64%	85%			149	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	54% (YES)	77% (YES)			131	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					598	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested