

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Pam Stewart, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: ALDEN ROAD EXCEP. STUDENT CENTER

District Name: Duval

Principal: Tammy Boyd

SAC Chair: Margie Cupp

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 12/3/2012

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)
					2011-2012 FAA Summary Scores Number of students Performance Level- 4-9= proficient Academic Area Assessed Not Assessed No score 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Reading 42 0 1 6 14 14 3 2 1 2 0 0 Math 43 0 0 6 12 12 8 3 1 1 0 0 Writing 15 0 0 2 4 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 Science 29 0 0 1 9 6 4 0 8 0 0 1 Reading Proficient 8/42 = 19% Math Proficient 13/43 = 30% Writing Proficient 1/15 = 6% Science Proficient 13/29 = 44% Principal of Fort Caroline Elementary 2010-2011: Grade: B Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 72%, Science Mastery: 47% Reading Learning Gains: 65% Math Learning Gains: 74%

Principal	Tammy Boyd	BA- Psychology ESE K-12, Principal Certification; Level II Principal Reading Endorsed	2	8	<p>Reading Lowest 25%: 48% Math Lowest 25%: 83% AYP: 100%</p> <p>Principal of Fort Caroline Elementary 2009-2010: Grade: C Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 62%, Science Mastery: 37% Reading Learning Gains: 55% Math Learning Gains: 57% Reading Lowest 25%: 52% Math Lowest 25%: 65% AYP: 79%, SWD did not make AYP in Reading, B, ED and SWD, B, ED did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>Principal of Fort Caroline Elementary 2008- 2009: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 73%, Science Mastery: 28% Reading Learning Gains: 67% Math Learning Gains: 70% Reading Lowest 25%: 65% Math Lowest 25%: 77% AYP: 82%, B, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math.</p> <p>Principal of Fort Caroline Elementary 2007-2008: Grade: C Reading Mastery: 74%, Math Mastery: 74%, Science Mastery: 41% Reading Learning Gains: 61% Math Learning Gains: 55% Reading Lowest 25%: 54% Math Lowest 25%: 63% AYP: 87%, SWD did not make AYP in Reading, B, ED and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p>
-----------	------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)
All subject areas, grades Pre-K -12th for students functioning at the Participatory, Supported and Independent levels	Susan Tucker	B.A. Physical Education K-12 Adapted PE Endorsement M.Ed. Mental Retardation Certification in Educational Leadership	7	7	<p>Ms. Tucker is serving as the Instructional and Transition Coach for Alden Road #252. The students are all assessed on the Alternate Assessment and do not receive schools grades. 2011-2012 FAA Summary Scores Number of students Performance Level- 4- 9= proficient Academic Area Assessed Not Assessed No score 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Reading 42 0 1 6 14 14 3 2 1 2 0 0 Math 43 0 0 6 12 12 8 3 1 1 0 0 Writing 15 0 0 2 4 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 Science 29 0 0 1 9 6 4 0 8 0 0 1 Reading Proficient 8/42 = 19% Math Proficient 13/43 = 30% Writing Proficient 1/15 = 6% Science Proficient 13/29 = 44%</p> <p>NA- Ms. Tucker is a shared coach for 2 Exceptional Student Center Schools, Alden Road #252, and Palm Avenue #170. The students at these schools are all assessed on the Alternate Assessment and do not receive schools grades.</p>

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	RECRUIT • Work with the University of North Florida to provide opportunities to students for practicums and internships.	Principal	June 2013	
2	• Transition to teach program provides opportunities for candidates to participate in practicums and internships to gain knowledge.	Principal Robyne Dubberly, PDF	June 2013	
3	• Interview qualified applicants	Principal Leadership team Mentors	August 2012	
4	RETAIN • Provide all new teachers with in-house mentors	Principal Mentors: Hope Gostkowski Rhonda Giffin	August, 2012	
5	• Each new teacher is assigned to a collegial team to provide support and training.	Principal Collegial team	August, 2012	

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
All classroom teachers are in field and highly qualified.	

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
41	4.9%(2)	19.5%(8)	31.7%(13)	41.5%(17)	51.2%(21)	70.7%(29)	0.0%(0)	4.9%(2)	9.8%(4)

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
			. Review and support an understanding of the core curriculum used for Language Arts courses.

Robyne Dubberly	Darrell Edmunds	Both teaching Language Arts curriculums. Ms. Dubberly is versed in the reading Curriculums-Reading Mastery, PCI Reading and ULS. Ms. Dubberly is certified in CET.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Give assistance with the use of OnCourse Gradebook set up and Encore for IEPs. Refer teacher to the appropriate staff to give addition assistance. 3. Share best practices and various delivery models that work for InD level students. Review zoning and lesson plans. 4. Schedule time in other classes to observe best practices. Discuss options for adding supplemental activities to build upon and support core curriculum through work stations.
Sonia Huffman	Amber Bixler	Both teaching self-contained classroom setting and using the same core curriculums. Ms. Huffman is experienced with creating be behavior management plans to address individual needs. Ms. Huffman is certified in CET.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and support an understanding of the core curriculums used in all academic areas for Access Point Courses. 2. Give assistance with the use of OnCourse Gradebook set up and Encore for IEPs. Refer teacher to the appropriate staff to give addition assistance. 3. Share best practices and various delivery models that work for InD/CSS level students. Review zoning and lesson plans. 4. Schedule time in other classes to observe best practices. Discuss options for adding supplemental activities to build upon and support core curriculum through work stations.

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

None
This item is not applicable.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

None
This item is not applicable.

Title I, Part D

None
This item is not applicable.

Title II

None
This item is not applicable.

Title III

None
This item is not applicable.

Title X- Homeless

None
This item is not applicable.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Add teachers to reduce class size.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school will continue with the implementation of the district's Foundation Program. The foundation team is working on developing lesson plans and procedures for all transition areas that are implemented school-wide to promote and maintain a safe and orderly school environment. The school utilizes classroom teachers to conduct lessons on the district character traits, self monitoring behaviors and self advocacy. School interventionists and the autistic site coach work in select classes to teach positive intervention techniques. The school has purchased instructional materials that cover bullying, conflict resolution and other character education traits that lead to students making appropriate decisions.

Nutrition Programs

None
This item is not applicable.

Housing Programs

None
This item is not applicable.

Head Start

None
This item is not applicable.

Adult Education

None
This item is not applicable.

Career and Technical Education

None
This item is not applicable.

Job Training

CBVE (Community Based Vocational Educational) opportunities are provided for qualifying students. These work opportunities provide practice for employability skills as well as increasing levels of self-advocacy and independence.

Other

- IDEA funds are used to hire job coaches, interpreters, and student focused paraprofessionals for high maintenance students.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

100% of the population is Tier III. All students served at this school are district assigned and are classified as Tier III.

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?

This item is not applicable.

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?

This item is not applicable.

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.

100% of the student population is in tier III.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

This item is not applicable.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Susan Tucker
- Diana Owens
- Monica McVay
- Hope Gostkowski
- Jeryl Bodack
- Lulee Rady

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to discuss curriculum needs, to observe implementation for fidelity, to review data and train staff.

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

To support the implementation of PCI Reading, Unique Learning Systems, use of technology with literacy instruction and review student reading data.

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.

No Pre-School
Not applicable

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All teachers are instructed in reading strategies to support reading across the curriculum.
Vocational teachers apply reading as it applies to real life experiences in the real world of work.

*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?

PLCs work together to develop lesson plans that associate all learning with real life opportunities.
Alden Road School serves three distinct levels of students whose transition to adult life is based on their medical/physical complexity, cognitive and social/emotional levels. Each will require different levels of support.
Transition into post school life requires a continuum of support to include:

1. Total care by families and agencies
2. Sheltered workshop employment
3. Supported employment through Vocational Rehabilitation (could include semi-independent living), to Independent employment with independent living with various degrees of support as needed for financial, medical, employment and transportation needs.

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?

Each student's program of study is personalized based on student needs, family and community agency collaboration. Through the IEP process, each student's level is evaluated. A course of study is developed to support the student to best meet his/her transition needs as determined through school, family and community agency collaboration. Each year the course of study is reviewed and adjustments are made if warranted.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

All students are eligible to continue their education until reaching the age of twenty two. A full time school based job developer and four job coaches are on staff to provide support and real life employment opportunities for students in the community. Students participate in the CBVE Work Enclave program which involves going out to various work sites in the community for volunteer on-the-job training.
The job developer works closely with community agencies to provide students with transition services and gainful employment after graduation.
Students are referred to Vocational Rehabilitation by the age of fourteen. During the school year, parent training is provided by various community agencies offering transition services. Eligible students participate in the off campus work experience program.

Conferences are scheduled and conducted with parents. Parents are made aware of the importance of making application to ADP and are encouraged to complete the application and submit it to APD each year during the IEP meeting. The School Job Developer also assists with this process along with the district Transition Support Staff in effort to ensure the process has been completed before exiting school.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (15)	28% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not assess at that level.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach Classroom teacher Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Leadership team Standards coach District staff Focus walk teams Standards coach Principal Leadership team Standards coach Principal Leadership team Standards coach Standards coach 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review of assessment data Review of PPR forms Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Annual review of IEPs Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Review of meeting minutes Training Training Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations Review of the materials list Review of the materials list Review mentoring assignments 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection forms PPR Rubric Lesson plans Access points IEP objectives Access points Lesson plans Access points Meeting minutes Training schedule Training schedule Expenditures Expenditures Expenditures Classroom observations

	models. 9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction. 10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels 11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use. 12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.	Collegial mentors	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	--

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:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (6)	15% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of data collection forms and assessment data.	Grading/Assessment Rubrics and data collection forms.
2		Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements and align student IEP objectives with strategies for accessing State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans and annual review of IEPs	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements IEP objectives Access points
		Teachers will incorporate	Classroom teacher	Quarterly review of	Lesson plans

3	a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points	Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	classroom lesson plans	Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction
4	Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys

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:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. The Florida Alternate Assessment does not rate students in this category. Proficient is the highest level reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable, no reported data	Not applicable, no reported data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.

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:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (2)	6% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments and will track student progress on data collection forms, performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data Review of data collection forms	Data collection forms Grading/Assessment Rubrics
		Teachers will continue training on the use of	Leadership team Instructional coach	Training	Training schedule PLC meeting notes

2		Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.	District staff		
3		Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys
4		Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction
5		Teachers will align student IEP objectives with strategies for accessing State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points

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:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39.4% (18)	40.4%(19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	1. Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. 2. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. 3. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points 4. Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points 5. Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points 6. Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Classroom Teachers 4. Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach 5. Classroom teacher 6. Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams 7. Leadership team Standards coach District staff 8. Focus walk teams Standards coach	1. Review of assessment data 2. Review of PPR forms 3. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 4. Annual review of IEPs 5. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 6. Review of meeting minutes 7. Training 8. Training 9. Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations 10. Review of the materials list 11. Review of the	1. Data collection forms 2. PPR Rubric 3. Lesson plans Access points 4. IEP objectives Access points 5. Lesson plans Access points 6. Meeting minutes 7. Training schedule 8. Training schedule 9. Expenditures 10. Expenditures 11. Expenditures 12. Classroom observations

1		<p>planning, and delivery.</p> <p>7. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.</p> <p>8. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models.</p> <p>9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction.</p> <p>10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels</p> <p>11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.</p> <p>12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.</p>	<p>9.Principal</p> <p>10.Leadership team</p> <p>Standards coach</p> <p>11.Principal Leadership team Standards coach</p> <p>12.Standards coach Collegial mentors</p>	<p>materials list</p> <p>12.Review mentoring assignments</p>	
---	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	--

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

<p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #3b:</p>	<p>Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>48%(8)</p>	<p>49%(9)</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 functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at</p>	<p>Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.</p> <p>Teachers will track student progress on data</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Review of assessment data</p> <p>Review of data collection forms</p>	<p>Data collection forms</p> <p>Grading/Assessment Rubrics</p>

	that level.	collection forms, performance skills and student work samples.			
2		Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements
3		Teachers will align student IEP objectives with strategies for accessing State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points
4		Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys

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:	86% (6) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading as reported on the Florida Alternate Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (6)	87% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 #					
	In 2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by 21%.					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	35	41	47	53	59	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Reduce the percentage of black students not making satisfactory progress by 20% and white students by 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Black: 87% (16) White: 76% (13)			Black: 67% (13) White: 50% (8)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.
2					
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion. 	Continuously assess students using the common core curriculum assessments and a variety of other reading assessment tools.	Tammy Boyd-Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of assessment data 	Instructional Program Curriculum Assessments
4					
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not knowing content topics to be assessed on the Florida Alternate Assessment. It is very difficult for our students to generalize information that has not been taught or experienced. 	<p>Develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.</p> <p>Incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points</p>	Tammy Boyd-Principal	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans

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:	Because of the low number of students in the school, there are not sufficient numbers in the subgroups for data to be reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable No reported data	Not applicable No reported data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.

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:	Reduce the percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress by 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(27)	59%(21)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach Classroom teacher Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Leadership team Standards coach District staff 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review of assessment data Review of data forms Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Annual review of IEPs Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Review of meeting minutes Training 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection forms Grades and rubric Lesson plans Access points IEP objectives Access points Lesson plans Access points Meeting minutes Training schedule

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:	Reduce the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(15)	61%(11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion. 	<p>Track student progress on data collection forms, performance skills checklists and student work samples.</p> <p>Align student IEP objectives with strategies for accessing State Standards/Access Points.</p> <p>Provided time for teacher training and collaboration on use of student data, instructional planning and delivery.</p>	Tammy Boyd-Principal	Review and discuss data forms, student work, and checklist through focus walks and PLC meetings	Meeting minutes Focus Walk forms

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
Review and discuss Data in PLCs Identify and plan for moving from level 3 to level 4 and levels 2 to 3	6-12	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Review and discuss data notebook Review of student task data sheets Target level 3 and 4 students Review instructional strategies Use FAA format to test students	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson PLC teams
Share best practices and instructional strategies that yield results to support SIP academic goals	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Provide teachers the opportunity to observe best practices Target practices to use in class Observe to monitor and assess implementation	Principal School Instructional Coach Support Staff
Examine Core Curriculum Assessment tools that best identify student progress in reading: ULS comprehension, PCI Reading Assessments, Environmental Print, Brigance	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Assessment Rollout Review Class observations during assessment administration Monitor assessment data for ULS, PCI Reading, Environmental Print, Brigance	Principal School Instructional Coach
					Use data from all assessments to develop IEP PLOPS	

Evaluating student work and progress	6-12	Selected classroom teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC meetings	with teachers Review updated portfolio work with current data Share work samples (types of appropriate exhibits of student work)	Principal School Instructional Coach
--------------------------------------	------	-----------------------------	-------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Folders for collection of student work	According folders	General Budget	\$229.50
			Subtotal: \$229.50
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: \$229.50

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (16)	29% (17)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach Classroom teacher Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Leadership team Standards coach District staff Focus walk teams Standards coach Principal Leadership team Standards coach Principal Leadership team Standards coach Standards coach Collegial mentors 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review of assessment data Review of PPR forms Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Annual review of IEPs Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans Review of meeting minutes Training Training Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations Review of the materials list Review of the materials list Review mentoring assignments 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection forms PPR Rubric Lesson plans Access points IEP objectives Access points Lesson plans Access points Meeting minutes Training schedule Training schedule Expenditures Expenditures Expenditures Classroom observations

	<p>instruction.</p> <p>10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels</p> <p>11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.</p> <p>12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.</p>		
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. The Florida Alternate Assessment does not rate students in this category. Proficient is the highest level reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not reported by the FAA. No reported data	Not reported by the FAA. No reported data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (22)	42% (23)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	1. Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. 2. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. 3. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Classroom Teachers 4. Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach	1. Review of assessment data 2. Review of PPR forms 3. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 4. Annual review of IEPs 5. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 6. Review of meeting	1. Data collection forms 2. PPR Rubric 3. Lesson plans Access points 4. IEP objectives Access points 5. Lesson plans Access points

1	4. Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	5. Classroom teacher	minutes	6. Meeting minutes
	5. Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points	6. Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams	7. Training 8. Training	7. Training schedule 8. Training schedule
	6. Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery.	7. Leadership team Standards coach District staff	9. Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations	9. Expenditures 10. Expenditures
	7. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.	8. Focus walk teams Standards coach	10. Review of the materials list 11. Review of the materials list	11. Expenditures 12. Classroom observations
	8. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models.	9. Principal	12. Review mentoring assignments	
	9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction.	10. Leadership team Standards coach		
	10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels	11. Principal Leadership team Standards coach		
	11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.	12. Standards coach Collegial mentors		
	12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.			

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	36% (12) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics as Reported on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (10)	35% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	1. Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. 2. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms. 3. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points 4. Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points 5. Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points 6. Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery. 7. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction. 8. Teachers will be	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Classroom Teachers 4. Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach 5. Classroom teacher 6. Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams 7. Leadership team Standards coach District staff 8. Focus walk teams Standards coach 9. Principal 10. Leadership team Standards coach 11. Principal Leadership team	1. Review of assessment data 2. Review of PPR forms 3. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 4. Annual review of IEPs 5. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans 6. Review of meeting minutes 7. Training 8. Training 9. Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data 10. Review of the materials list 11. Review of the materials list 12. Review mentoring assignments	1. Data collection forms 2. PPR Rubric 3. Lesson plans Access points 4. IEP objectives Access points 5. Lesson plans Access points 6. Meeting minutes 7. Training schedule 8. Training schedule 9. Expenditures 10. Expenditures 11. Expenditures 12. Classroom observations

	<p>trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models.</p> <p>9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction.</p> <p>10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels</p> <p>11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.</p> <p>12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.</p>	<p>Standards coach</p> <p>12. Standards coach</p> <p>Collegial mentors</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # In 2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by 14%				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	37	43	48	54	60	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Reduce the percentage of black students not making satisfaction progress by 25%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Black: 82% (6)	Black: 57% (4)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.
2	The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion.	Utilize core math instructional programs and materials with fidelity: Everyday Counts Calendar Math, Unique Learning Systems and Number Worlds.	Tammy Boyd-Principal	Conduct classroom observations, review lesson plans and student work	Student work and lesson plans
3	Not knowing content topics to be assessed on the Florida Alternate Assessment. It is very difficult for our students to generalize information that has not been taught or experienced.	Schedule CBI trips that provide student opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of math concepts and skills learned.	Tammy Boyd-Principal	Calendar of CBI trips Lesson plans Student work	Student work

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Because of the low number of students in the school, there are not sufficient numbers in the subgroups for data to be reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable, no reported data	Not applicable, no reported data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.	Not applicable. See narrative.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Reduce the percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress by 14%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (11)	57% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1.	1. Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Classroom	1. Review of assessment data 2. Review of PPR forms	1. Data collection forms 2. PPR Rubric

1	<p>The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.</p>	<p>2. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms.</p> <p>3. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points</p> <p>4. Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points</p> <p>5. Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points</p> <p>6. Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery.</p> <p>7. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.</p> <p>8. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models.</p> <p>9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction.</p> <p>10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels</p> <p>11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.</p> <p>12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.</p>	<p>Teachers</p> <p>3. Classroom Teachers</p> <p>4. Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach</p> <p>5. Classroom teacher</p> <p>6. Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams</p> <p>7. Leadership team Standards coach District staff</p> <p>8. Focus walk teams Standards coach</p> <p>9. Principal</p> <p>10. Leadership team Standards coach</p> <p>11. Principal Leadership team Standards coach</p> <p>12. Standards coach Collegial mentors</p>	<p>3. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>4. Annual review of IEPs</p> <p>5. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>6. Review of meeting minutes</p> <p>7. Training</p> <p>8. Training</p> <p>9. Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations</p> <p>10. Review of the materials list</p> <p>11. Review of the materials list</p> <p>12. Review mentoring assignments</p>	<p>3. Lesson plans Access points</p> <p>4. IEP objectives Access points</p> <p>5. Lesson plans Access points</p> <p>6. Meeting minutes</p> <p>7. Training schedule</p> <p>8. Training schedule</p> <p>9. Expenditures</p> <p>10. Expenditures</p> <p>11. Expenditures</p> <p>12. Classroom observations</p>
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making

satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Reduce the percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress by 11%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (5)	56% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion.	Conduct school-wide assessments in math utilizing Brigance Early Development II, Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills II Develop lesson plans that are aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements. Align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Tammy Boyd-Principal	Review assessment data and determine next instructional steps for each student	Meeting minutes from PLC

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	Increase the percentage of students scoring level 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics by 1%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (4)	21% (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
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments. Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms,	Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data Review of data collection forms	Data collection forms Grading/Assessment Rubrics

1	with performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements
	Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom teacher	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points
	Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction
	Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys
	Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams	Training	Training schedule PLC meeting notes
	Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction	Leadership team Instructional coach District staff		

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:	Increase the percentage of students scoring level 7 in mathematics by 1%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	1% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data	Data collection forms
		Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of data collection forms	Grading/Assessment Rubrics
		Teachers will develop	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements

1	lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points
	Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction
	Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys
	Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams		

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:	Increase the percentage of students making gains in mathematics by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (10)	84% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data	Data collection forms
		Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of data collection forms	Grading/Assessment Rubrics
		Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements
		Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points
		Teachers will	Classroom	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of

	<p>incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points</p> <p>Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.</p> <p>Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.</p>	<p>teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p> <p>Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams</p> <p>Leadership team Instructional coach District staff</p>	<p>Review of meeting minutes</p> <p>Training</p>	<p>Instruction</p> <p>Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys</p> <p>Training schedule PLC meeting notes</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Mathematics Goal # In 2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by 21%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	37	43	48	54	60	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Reduce the percentage of black students not making satisfaction progress by 25%.
Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 82% (6)	Black 57% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a 	Conduct school-wide assessments in math utilizing Brigance Early Development II, Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills II	Principal	Utilization and review of assessments, data collection and student work samples specifically generated from curriculums and Brigance Inventories.	Student results PLC Meeting minutes

	typical fashion.				
2		Continuously assess students using a variety of mathematical assessments and skill performance check points and student work samples to track student progress.	Principal	Conduct classroom observations to monitor implementation of instructional mathematics lessons during instructional time.	Focus Walk Forms

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Reduce the percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress by 14%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (11)	57% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion.	Develop lesson plans that are aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Principal	Conduct classroom observations to monitor implementation of lesson plans	focus walk lesson plans
2		Use provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and lesson	Principal	PLC discussions of curriculum content and instructional best practices and results of	PLC Agendas and meeting minutes

		delivery.		student work and assessments in math.	
3		Utilize core math instructional programs and materials with fidelity: Everyday Counts Calendar Math, Unique Learning Systems and Number Worlds.	Principal	Utilization and review of assessments, data collection and student work samples specifically generated from curriculums and Brigance Inventories.	Data charts

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Reduce the percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress by 11%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (5)	56% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	• The functioning levels of students being tested. Students function at a severe to moderate cognitive disabled level. This impacts their ability to process, comprehend, and apply information in a typical fashion.	Conduct school-wide assessments in math utilizing Brigance Early Development II, Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills II	Principal	Utilization and review of assessments, data collection and student work samples specifically generated from curriculums and Brigance Inventories.	Instructional Program Curriculum Assessments Course Performance Skills Checklists, Rubrics Brigance Inventory
2		Utilize core math instructional programs and materials with fidelity: Everyday Counts Calendar Math, Unique Learning Systems and Number Worlds.	Principal	Conduct classroom observations to monitor implementation of instructional mathematics lessons during instructional time.	Focus walk forms
3		Develop lesson plans that are aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Principal	Conduct classroom observations to monitor implementation of instructional mathematics lessons during instructional time.	Lesson plans

End of High School Mathematics Goals

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:	
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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
Review and discuss Data in PLCs Identify and plan for moving from level 3 to level 4 and levels 2 to 3	6-12	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC meetings	Review and discuss data notebook Review of student task data sheets Target level 3 and 4 students Review instructional strategies Use FAA format to test students	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson PLC teams
Florida Alternate Assessment; administration and accommodations	6-11	Principal Test Coordinator Select classroom teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	LLT will provide supports in test accommodations Therapists/Behavior team will assist in providing accommodations Resource teachers will assist with class coverage while teachers do individual testing	Principal Test Coordinator School Instructional Coach Support Staff
Share best practices and instructional					Provide teachers the opportunity to observe	Principal

strategies that yield results to support SIP academic goals	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	best practices Target practices to use in class Observe to monitor and assess implementation	School Instructional Coach Support Staff
-------------------------------------------------------------	------	-------------------	-------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:			Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
30.3 (8)			31.3 (9)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and	1. Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Classroom Teachers	1.Review of assessment data 2.Review of PPR forms 3.Quarterly review of	1.Data collection forms 2.PPR Rubric 3.Lesson plans

1	<p>does not adequately assess at that level.</p>	<p>2. Teachers will track student progress on PPR forms.</p> <p>3. Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points</p> <p>4. Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points</p> <p>5. Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance instruction and reinforce Access Points</p> <p>6. Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning, and delivery.</p> <p>7. Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.</p> <p>8. Teachers will be trained to deliver instruction using the components of appropriate instructional models.</p> <p>9. Purchase classroom materials to strengthen instruction.</p> <p>10. Classroom staff will be consulted to determine the types of additional materials needed to reinforce applied academics for the participatory and supported student levels</p> <p>11. The materials needed to reinforce academic achievement and functional performance for the participatory and supported student levels will be reviewed and purchased for classroom use.</p> <p>12. Mentors will be assigned assist teachers who are having difficulties with the infusion of access points.</p>	<p>3. Classroom Teachers</p> <p>4. Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Standards Coach</p> <p>5. Classroom teacher</p> <p>6. Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams</p> <p>7. Leadership team Standards coach District staff</p> <p>8. Focus walk teams Standards coach</p> <p>9. Principal</p> <p>10. Leadership team Standards coach</p> <p>11. Principal Leadership team Standards coach</p> <p>12. Standards coach Collegial mentors</p>	<p>classroom lesson plans</p> <p>4. Annual review of IEPs</p> <p>5. Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>6. Review of meeting minutes</p> <p>7. Training</p> <p>8. Training</p> <p>9. Review of IEPs Review of PPRs Review of assessment data Classroom observations</p> <p>10. Review of the materials list</p> <p>11. Review of the materials list</p> <p>12. Review mentoring assignments</p>	<p>Access points</p> <p>4. IEP objectives Access points</p> <p>5. Lesson plans Access points</p> <p>6. Meeting minutes</p> <p>7. Training schedule</p> <p>8. Training schedule</p> <p>9. Expenditures</p> <p>10. Expenditures</p> <p>11. Expenditures</p> <p>12. Classroom observations</p>
---	--------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data	Data collection forms
		Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of data collection forms	Grading/Assessment Rubrics
		Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements
		Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points
		Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction
		Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.	Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams	Review of meeting minutes	Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys
		Teachers will continue training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.	Leadership team Instructional coach District staff	Training	Training schedule PLC meeting notes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (1)	5% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not	Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.	Classroom Teachers	Review of assessment data	Data collection forms

1	developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.	Classroom Teachers	Review of data collection forms	Grading/Assessment Rubrics
		Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.	Classroom Teachers	Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans	Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements
		Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points	Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach	Annual review of IEPs	IEP objectives Access points

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Because of the low number of students in the school, there are not sufficient numbers in the subgroups for data to be reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not reported by the FAA. No reported data	Not reported by the FAA. No reported data

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. See narrative	Not applicable. See narrative	Not applicable. See narrative	Not applicable. See narrative	Not applicable. See narrative

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (10)	44% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	<p>Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.</p> <p>Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.</p> <p>Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.</p> <p>Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points</p> <p>Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points</p> <p>Teachers will be provided time to collaborate on student data, instructional planning and delivery.</p> <p>Teachers will continue</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p> <p>Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p> <p>Principal Classroom teacher Collaborative teams</p> <p>Leadership team Instructional coach District staff</p>	<p>Review of assessment data</p> <p>Review of data collection forms</p> <p>Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>Annual review of IEPs</p> <p>Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>Review of meeting minutes</p> <p>Training</p>	<p>Data collection forms</p> <p>Grading/Assessment Rubrics</p> <p>Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements</p> <p>IEP objectives Access points</p> <p>Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction</p> <p>Meeting minutes Teacher Feedback Surveys</p> <p>Training schedule PLC meeting notes</p>

	training on the use of Access Points to develop Standards based instruction.		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (1)	5% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	<p>Teachers will continuously assess students using a variety of assessments.</p> <p>Teachers will track student progress on data collection forms, with performance skills and student work samples.</p> <p>Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.</p> <p>Teachers will align student IEP objectives with State Standards/Access Points</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Review of assessment data</p> <p>Review of data collection forms</p> <p>Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>Annual review of IEPs</p>	<p>Data collection forms</p> <p>Grading/Assessment Rubrics</p> <p>Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements</p> <p>IEP objectives Access points</p>

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review and discuss Data in PLCs Identify and plan for moving from level 3 to level 4 and levels 2 to 3	6-12	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Review and discuss data notebook Review of student task data sheets Target level 3 and 4 students Review instructional strategies Use FAA format to test students	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson PLC teams
Examine Core						

Curriculum Assessment tools that best identify student progress in reading: ULS comprehension, PCI Reading Assessments, Environmental Print, Brigance	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Assessment Rollout Review Class observations during assessment administration Monitor assessment data for ULS, PCI Reading, Environmental Print, Brigance	Principal School Instructional Coach
Share best practices and instructional strategies that yield results to support SIP academic goals	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Provide teachers the opportunity to observe best practices Target practices to use in class Observe to monitor and assess implementation	Principal School Instructional Coach Support Staff

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (6)	29% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Students are assessed using the Florida Alternate Assessment. Based on the Florida Alternate Assessment, levels 4-9 are considered proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% (1)	8% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students functioning at the profound /participatory levels score a level 1. The FAA is not developmental and does not adequately assess at that level.	<p>Teachers will develop lesson plans aligned with State Standards Access Points and course requirements.</p> <p>Teachers will align student IEP objectives with strategies for accessing State Standards/Access Points</p> <p>Teachers will incorporate a variety of materials in lesson plans to enhance and differentiate instruction and provide access and reinforcement of State Standards Access Points</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p> <p>Classroom teacher Collaborative teams Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p> <p>Annual review of IEPs</p> <p>Quarterly review of classroom lesson plans</p>	<p>Lesson plans Access points/Course requirements</p> <p>IEP objectives Access points</p> <p>Lesson plans Access points Instructional Accommodations Observation of Instruction</p>

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
Review and discuss Data in PLCs Identify and plan for moving from level 3 to level 4 and levels 2 to 3	6-12	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Review and discuss data notebook Review of student task data sheets Target level 3 and 4 students Review instructional strategies Use FAA format to test students	Principal School Instructional Coach PLC chairperson PLC teams
Examine Core Curriculum Assessment tools that best identify student progress in writing: Writing with purpose ,ULS/ Transition writing activities, PCI writing, Assessments, Environmental Print, Brigrance	6-12	Selected teachers	School wide	Early Dismissal and PLC Meetings	Assessment Rollout Review Class observations during assessment administration Monitor assessment data for Writing with purpose, ULS/ Transition writing, PCI writing, Environmental Print, Brigrance,	Principal School Instructional Coach

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
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.

Civics Goal # 1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Many of our students are medically fragile and are out of school for surgeries or medical conditions
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
99.5% (179)	99.5% (167)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
10	9
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Numerous students require various surgeries to improve their condition, resulting in long term absences. Because of our large geographic attendance zone and the disabilities of our students; if a student misses the bus and the parents do not drive, then the student will not be able to attend that day.	For students whose absence is not due to medical needs, counsel with students and parents as to the importance of regular attendance. Work with transportation to adjust pick up times Discuss with parents the possibility of scheduling surgeries during non school periods,	Principal School Social Worker School Nurse	Review attendance data	Online attendance reports

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

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

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

PLC will review the attendance data as it relates to test results.	6-12	PLCs	School wide	PLC Meetings	review data School Social Worker will contact parents and monitor attendance tracking forms	Leadership team School Nurse School Social Worker
--------------------------------------------------------------------	------	------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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:	Students are only suspended if they have had multiple interventions and parent conferences unless it is a Class 3 or 4 Code of Conduct offense which would be referred for a Conduct Review meeting with district intervention staff.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
6	6

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
5	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	Due to the nature and behaviors manifested by the students' disability, high magnitude behaviors are random and not always predictable or manageable through typical behavior plans. The behaviors may result as a manifestation of the disability.	Students participate in Self Determination lessons conducted by classroom teachers. Individual behavior intervention plans are developed for specific students. Individual counseling from school Social Worker, Behavior Interventionists and mentoring teachers is provided. Parent conferencing solicited. Conduct review meetings with district based intervention teams solicited. Development of FBAs conducted.	Principal Behavior Interventionists Social Worker Classroom Teachers	Review of individual Behavior plans Behavioral contracts Behavior team collaboration	Behaviors are continually monitored and maintained through zoning plans, differentiated instruction and by strategies created by teachers and intervention staff, as well as thru data observation charts, FBAs, behavior contracts and plans.

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
Teaching Self Determination: Positive Attitudes and student self monitoring Behavior Tools 1 and 2 PCM certification	6-12	Behavior Interventionists District Trainers	School wide	Early Dismissal monthly	Review of the end of year suspension data Certifications on record	Principal Behavior Interventionists

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Self Determination class 2nd STEPS program Staff workshop on implementing positive behavior strategies	Students are instructed on monitoring behavior and de escalation techniques. Research based curriculum for problem solving School intervention staff		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide recognition incentives	Rewards money	General budget	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
			Grand Total: \$100.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention		Students at this school are eligible to remain in school until reaching the age of 22. Therefore, it appears that they are retained in the 12th grade for 4 years. 100% of the students, who reached the age of 22 during the school year, met graduation requirements and graduated. 100% of the students who graduated prior to the age of 22 met all graduation requirements.			
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:					
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:			
0% (0)		0% (0)			
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:			
100% (27)		100% (46)			
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	Per district mandate that all students now graduate at age 18 or the age at which all required credits are completed, many students may opt out in returning as post graduates. Post graduate status	Students are encouraged to remain until the age of 22. Parent conferences are arranged to encourage parents to allow students to remain until reaching 22. Agencies are involved to explain to parents	Administrative Staff Job Developer	Review the number of students eligible to graduate and the number of students remaining to age out.	Review data

provides our students with 3-4 more years of valuable employability and life skills training up to age 22.	what supports are available to students when they reach the age of 22.			
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

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
PLCs discuss the benefits of students returning to school as post-graduates upon graduation.	Grade 12 with 24 credits	Job Developer Principal	All PLCs	Weekly Graduation-Transition meetings	Review of data	Ms. Edmunds Ms. Tucker Ms. Boyd Leadership-Graduation Committee

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Parent involvement includes: PTA meetings, IEP meetings Parent workshops, MRT meetings, Open House, Transition Meetings and Student events
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
52% (93)	55% (92)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Geographic location: Attendance area covers the distance from the Beaches to South Mandarin. 10% (17) of our students live in group homes or foster care with no parent responsibility. It is difficult for our parents to get out for meetings with handicapped students. Transportation and child care are also barriers. A number of students are not in foster care, but live in non-guardianship situations with no one acting as legal guardian.	e-mail Duval Connect Printed notices Day and evening meetings Parent to parent presentations School web page Personal phone calls Parent surveys	Principal SAC chairperson PTA Classroom teachers Therapists	Monitor attendance Parent feedback Surveys Conferences	Review of parent attendance data and summary

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent involvement: IEP parent input surveys	6-12	Principal Administrative Assistant School Instructional Coach	Teachers Therapists	Early Dismissal Training	Review parent communication logs Parent input surveys Event sign-in sheets	Principal Teachers

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

IEP MRT	Copies of IEP surveys	Copies of parent surveys	General budget	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$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
Monthly Newsletter to inform and invite parents to trainings and school events	Copies of monthly newsletters and flyers		General Funding	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$500.00
				Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Safety Goal Safety Goal #1:		Based on review of 2011/2012 school year PCM data log, it was determined that an identified group of 16 students were being "coded" and removed from class. The action codes included seclusion/time out and physical restraint.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
171 Codes.		150 Codes.			
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	Alden Road has become a facility where students with high magnitude behaviors are being placed when not successful in comprehensive schools or other programs. Lack of parental cooperation Lack of medical intervention Difficulty getting parents to follow through with behavioral interventions at home Parents withholding adequate information	Individual positive behavior plan in IEP FBAs Increase the number of positive interactions between adults and students Teachers receive individualized training based on the student interventions needed	Principal Behavior interventionists	Monitor PCM data logs for the identified group of students	Review PCM data logs to determine the number of behavior codes weekly to identify the students in need of more support

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
Teachers receive individualized training based on the student interventions needed	6-12	Behavior Interventionist CSS Coach	School wide	Training is individualized and will be individually scheduled	Daily monitoring of the PCM intervention log	Behavior Interventionist CSS Coach

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Safety Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Folders for collection of student work	Accordinging folders	General Budget	\$229.50
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Dropout Prevention				\$0.00
Parent Involvement	IEP MRT	Copies of IEP Copies of parent surveys	General budget	\$500.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$729.50
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Dropout Prevention				\$0.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension	Self Determination class 2nd STEPS program Staff workshop on implementing positive behavior strategies	Students are instructed on monitoring behavior and de escalation techniques. Research based curriculum for problem solving School intervention staff		\$0.00
Dropout Prevention				\$0.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension	Provide recognition incentives	Rewards money	General budget	\$100.00
Dropout Prevention				\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Monthly Newsletter to inform and invite parents to trainings and school events	Copies of monthly newsletters and flyers	General Funding	\$500.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$600.00
				Grand Total: \$1,329.50

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="radio"/> Priority	<input type="radio"/> Focus	<input type="radio"/> Prevent	<input type="radio"/> 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 10/18/2012)

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
Planner for students	\$250.00
Incentatives for students	\$250.00
Student supplies	\$195.00

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

- Develop and review the School Improvement Plan
- Participate in the mid year evaluation of the School Improvement Plan
- Discuss transition opportunities for students

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found