FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ROBERT E. LEE HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Dr. Denise Hall

SAC Chair: Mr. Michael Hawk

Superintendent: Ed Pratt- Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 12/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	DeniseDuncanHall	Ph.D. Ed Leadership / MS Administration / BS. Math Ed.	7	17	J.E.B. Stuart Middle gains to C, 2002-2005. Robert E. Lee High School gains to C 2007-2009. Robert E. Lee High School drops to D 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.
Assis Principal	Jaime Dusinberre	M.Ed. Ed Leadership BA English English 6-12, Ed Leadership K-12	7	7	J.E.B. Stuart gains to C, 2002-2005. Robert E. Lee High School gains to C 2007-2009. Robert E. Lee High School drops to D 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.
Assis Principal	Marie George	B.A. Music Education M.A. Supervision and Administration EDD in progress Ed Leadership K-12 Music K-12	3	2	Sandalwood High School gains to an A in 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.

		M.Ed. Ed Leadership B.S. Mathematics			Terry Parker High School gains to a C 2009-2010
Assis Principal	Carolyn McDuffie	Ed.S Mathematics Ed Leadership K-12 Math 5-9	2	6	First Coast High School - drop to a D 2009-2010 First Coast High School – gains to a C 2010-2011 Robert E. Lee High School – gains to a B 2011 - 2012
Assis Principal	Corey Miller	Masters of Education Educational Leadership	1	7	Westwood Middle School 2006-2011 C Ed White High School 2011 - C
Assis Principal	Andrea Harter	B.A. Journalism /MFA/ Educational Leadership	6	1	A teacher at Lee during the years: CDCCB. Started ACT prep program at Lee which has posted gains each of the five years with nearly a 20 percent increase in composite scores. FCAT proficiency rate 2012: 51 percent proficienty rating; FCAT Writes 99 percent proficienty rating. The students involved in ACT prep involved 507. 85 percent of those students passed the Math portion, which substitutes for the FCAT if needed on concordant scores and 56 percent were at college-ready/FCAT concordant proficient for reading.

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)
Cross-Curricular	Laura Gruninger	Social Studies 6-12 Reading K-12 English 6-9	6	10	J.E.B. Stuart gains to C, 2002-2005. Robert E. Lee High School gains to C 2007-2009. Robert E. Lee High School drops to D 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.
ELA & Reading	Bonnie Curran	Elementary Education English 5-9 ESOL Reading Endorsement	3	1	Robert E. Lee High School drops to D 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.
Math	Natasha Morrison	Math 6-12	14	3	Robert E. Lee High School gains to a C in 2005. Robert E. Lee High School gains to C 2007-2009. Robert E. Lee High School drops to D 2010. Robert E. Lee High School gains to a B in 2011.

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. On-going professional development through planning period meetings, faculty meetings and quarterly instructional days.	Design Team	Ongoing	
2	2. Full-time instructional coaching staff to support and assist teachers in honing their craft.	Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Monthly Beginning Teacher meetings designed to keep new teachers connected, informed and on track in TIP.	PDF	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

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
92	19.6%(18)	22.8%(21)	32.6%(30)	19.6%(18)	25.0%(23)	0.0%(0)	8.7%(8)	1.1%(1)	9.8%(9)

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
Patrick Carmody	Jack Strickland	Department Chair, Mathematics	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Brenda Hennessey	Hillary Street	Chemistry teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Rosalyn Bloxom-Johnson	Irma Santos-Sandiago	World Language /Veteran Teacher w/15 years of experience	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Ronnie Smith	English Department Chair/Masters in English	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kelli Padgett	Alec Puig	Social Studies/Department Chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Suzanne Patterson	Instructional Coach/Data Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Marian Walker	Rebekah Padilla	Engineering/B&L Lead Teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Danielle MacClary	Bonnie Curran	Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Theresa Khiyami	ESE/Instructional Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

Bonnie Curran	Katie Kananen	Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Wynonna Johnson	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Bonnie Curran	Jean Luke	Reading/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Jon Allen	Morgan Hunter	Science	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Robert Baldwin	ROTC	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Karen Norris/Laura Gruninger	Sydney Wyatt	Close proximity. Is assigned a math buddy.	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Christine Howard	Science department chair and a phy	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Brenda Hennessey	Justin Lopez	Chemistry teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Shannon Falon	Math coach to math teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Truitt/Norris	Brittany Biggs	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Caroline Kagigh	Instructional coach as mentor with a math buddy assigned	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Deb Truitt	Emily May	ELA/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Patrick Carmody	Sean Rampacek	Math Department chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Thomas Gallagher	Instructional Coach as mentor with a biology buddy teacher	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kathy Kaleel	Elliot BOugis	Instructional Coach with support from WOrld Language department chair	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Kristin Bishop	Amy Donofrio	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Mark Ingram	Instructional coach with math buddy teacher assigned	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

Laura Gruninger	Evelyn Borland	Instructional Coach-social studies background	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Kyendal Eaton	ELA/Reading Coach	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Laura Gruninger	Jasmin Esparza	ESOL	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings
Vamecia Powell	Maritza Gonzalez	ELA	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly visits by mentor, PDF, district cadre. Weekly PLC meetings

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

Create a Parent Welcome Center offering resource materials to assist parents with developing strategies to insure their child's success in high school and beyond. Hold parent meetings focused on increasing parent involvement in their students' education.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

.

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

HOPE classes will participate in Fuel Up to Play 60 program that focuses on nutrition and exercise.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Continue to build an International Business and Logistics Career Academy focusing on logistics. The academy will continue to work with JaxPort to provide opportunities for future employment, scholarships, internships and experiences in logistics. Pursue a Non-Profit Career Academy for the Liberal Arts Community to begin with 2012-2013 school year.

Job Training

Job Training The Business and Logistics department has developed Lee's second academy and is on its way to becoming Nationally Certified by NCAC
The SEAM community students have an opportunity to become CAD certified – spell out the acronyms

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Denise Hall, Principal
Marie George, Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Carolyn McDuffie, Assistant Principal, RtI
Laura Gruninger, Instructional Coach
Bonnie Curran, Literacy Coach
Kelli Padgett, Social Studies Department Chair
Michelle Crossley-Taylor, Guidance Department Chair
Anne Jacques, Art Teacher

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

The focus of the RTI Leadership Team will be governed by the following essential questions: What does the data tell us? What do we want the data to tell us? What interventions will be used to meet the needs of students who did not demonstrate mastery after each core instruction and supplemental intervention? What other steps can we take to calibrate the work governing this initiative? The Leadership team will meet once a week as a whole group to monitor the progress of intervention strategies outlined in the School Improvement Plan. Teachers will screen data in their respective PLCs and make informed instructional decisions; an extensive review of data from formatives and benchmarks will assist in identifying intentional non-learners and failed learners. The PLCs will then devise a plan to provide interventions to students as per noted patterns and/or deficiencies presented by the data at hand. The administrative team will meet weekly to discuss classroom monitoring of instructional strategies and provide support. The teacher led RTI team will meet twice a month after the Lead teacher meets with the Leadership and Monitoring Teams. This team will fully support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans and ensure that the staff knows how and when to apply each Tier; will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content programs; will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; will identify systematic patterns of student needs and provide strategies gained via district training to identify appropriate, and evidence-based intervention strategies; will assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students and collect, analyze and disseminate data relating to progress made through RTI implementation.

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

The RTI Leadership team perused the data from the previous school year. Duties were disseminated at different levels for each subgroup of the RTI Leadership team. They worked together in the gathering of data used to develop the needs assessment of the school. The Principal shared the data with SAC to solicit their assistance with external resources. The Assistant Principal shared the PLC information with department heads to solicit their input as the SIP is developed, as well as, organized the needed training for the teacher-led RTI subgroup. Entities will be provided data on all targets set for each Tier; academic and social areas will be addressed via seminars and via Guidance Counselors for other students; the PLCs will develop a strategic plan to adjust classroom instruction and shift intentional interventions whenever there are areas that

need attention with the use of an interventionists. The RTI Leadership subgroups will collectively work together to monitor the interventions, adjust the modification thereof, and align the entire schemata. The SIP is a living document and will be treated as such, as data is collected, desegregated, analyzed and used to differentiate instruction for each child.

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.

The following sources will be used as based line data:
Reading: The results from IR Classes; the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) data retrieved via Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), and the 2011-2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), AP results for Mathematics and Science. Progress Monitoring: PMRN for Reading; Formatives; Summatives; Writing prompts and Benchmarks for Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Writing. Midyear Assessments: FAIR; School-based Common Assessments and District Benchmarks. End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, PSAT, PERT, and AP.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff was trained on RtI during our preplanning and will be trained throughout the year during planning period meetings and faculty meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The staff will create action plans to support the data reflecting student performance with time-lines.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Denise Hall, Principal
Jaime Dusinberre, Assistant Principal
Corey Miller, Assistant Principal
Laura Gruninger, Instructional Coach
Bonnie Curran, Literacy Coach
Kristin Bishop, ELA Department Chair
David Gaslin, Reading Department Chair
Janie Jones, Media Specialist

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

The Monitoring Team visits classes and shares the findings during the weekly meetings. A member of the monitoring team will meet with designated teachers during PLCs to discuss the assessment results and student progress. During classroom walkthroughs, teachers will provide a member of the monitoring team with a toolkit consisting of: lesson plans, data, student work, efforts of RTI and differentiated instruction (as noted on lesson plans) to address individual student needs. The areas of concern are shared with the Leadership team lead teacher. The Leadership Team brainstorms and shares strategies with the entire faculty. In addition, the Reading teacher shares the FAIR scores with the ELA teachers to ensure that they assist struggling students as evidenced by the data. In support of the district's reading goals and our school-based reading goals, we have established a bi-weekly protocol whereby each PLC investigates into our Reading deficiencies and discusses ways/strategies to close the gaps. Each PLC reviews data to ensure that reading in the content area is consistent with our school goals. The monitoring team meets with the teachers during Quarterly Curriculum Reviews to formulate plans for effective implementation of targeted reading goals and gauge the progress on targets set on the IPDP. The main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the way in which it is being delivered across all content and grade levels to provide next steps for improving the reading achievement of all students/subgroups.

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

Collaboration during PLC – Peruse data from common assessments, identify areas of concern and share strategies to address the weak areas.
Use Benchmark baseline data to implement mini focus lessons

The LLT will focus on reading and writing across the content areas, targeted reading strand instruction through FCIM, and authentic reading experiences.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

The Reading Coach will meet with the reading department during the PLC meetings to present strategies for reading in the content area. Teachers will share reading strategies during PLC, and the Reading coach will assist with understanding reading across all content areas. Teachers are knowledgeable of their subject matter, however; getting content across is sometimes a challenge in some classrooms. We plan to have faculty learning meetings to ensure that everyone understands all contexts in which teaching and learning occurs. That is, we will all be able to have students and texts in concert. We will discuss all aspects of content literacy instruction while ensuring that everyone understands the relationship between reading and learning. In addition, teachers are required to provide students with reading strategies for any and every piece of text read in class. All professional development includes reading strategies, creating an instructional tool box for teachers. All 9th grade teachers, as well as select 10th through 12th grade teachers.

*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?

Ninth grade teacher teams meet weekly to discuss cross-curricular connections and to develop interdisciplinary units. Teachers within each small learning community work to develop cross-curricular connections, making these transparent to their students during lessons and discussions. SLC teachers work to support each other in the areas of mathematics and science, social studies and writing, to assist students in seeing the relationships between subjects.

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?

Robert E. Lee High School is divided into 4 learning communities: Business and Logistics, Early College, Liberal Arts and SEAM (Science Engineering Academy Magnet). Students choose their learning community either through magnet application or registration. Course progressions are set in each learning community with the intent of providing students a meaningful course of study and experiences to prepare them for future studies in their areas of interest.

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

Students at Robert E. Lee High School meet twice per year with their guidance counselors during their 9th through 11th grade years. As 12th graders, they meet with their guidance counselors to discuss SAT/ACT, financial aid, scholarships and college application in both the fall and spring semesters. Counselors host a Financial Aid night each spring to assist families in the financial aid process and provide one-on-one assistance to all seniors during Beacon in February of each year. Robert E. Lee High School is a Jacksonville Commitment school and, therefore, has a full-time college counselor on staff Tuesdays and Thursdays who assists with college searches and applications, as well as scholarship searches and applications in the College

and Career Room.

In addition all 10th and 11th graders will be taking the PSAT. The PSAT has been offered to our Early College 9th graders to help assist guidance with college-readiness. The PSAT will provide the following: It gives the student a chance to enter many competitions for prestigious scholarships and recognition programs conducted by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation scholarship programs. Students and parents have been provide with the National Merit website for more information. It will be a "trial run" for the SAT. The students PSAT/NMSQT can be used to estimate your probable performance on the SAT. The scores will be helpful to the student in discussing his/her further education and choice of college with the guidance counselor. The counselors' activities, English IV teachers include the college application process as a major part of their first quarter instructions and assignments. Robert E. Lee High School's student mentoring program, SUMMIT, incorporates college and career planning information into the monthly sessions. With the help of Senate Bill 1908, Lee High School provides the College Placement Test for all juniors and seniors who have not taken a college-entrance exam in the spring of each year.

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:	Reading Goal #1A: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in reading from that of 41% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to 46% as our target for 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (447)	46% (500)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Stagnation and boredom.	. Provide students choice in reading materials in order to build interest and confidence. Increase opportunities to read in all content area classrooms	Intensive Reading Teachers Reading coach Administrators	. Academic Journals, Book Discussions	Portfolios, reading logs, book reviews
2	1.2. Students are embarrassed by their low levels of performance	Provide students choice in reading materials in order to build confidence. Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings	Intensive Reading Teachers Reading Coach Administrators	Student tracking via reading guides	Student conferences
3	1.3. Distractions	Model fluent reading habits	. Intensive Reading Teachers Reading coach Administrators	Guided/shared reading	formative and Summative assessments based on the standards

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing above-proficiency in reading from that of 14% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to 19% as shown on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (153)	19% (207)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Stagnation and boredom	2A.1. Provide students choice in reading materials in order to build interest and confidence. Increase opportunities to read in all content area classrooms	ELA/Intensive Reading Teachers	. Academic Journals, Book Discussions	Portfolios, reading logs, book reviews
2	Distractions.	Model Fluent Reading Habits.	ELA/ Intensive Reading Teachers	Chunking/Peer Evaluations	Student Conferences
3	Students desire more opportunities to read in all content area classrooms.	Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings	ELA/Reading teachers	Student tracking via reading guides	Student conferences

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing reading gains from that of 56% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to 61% as shown on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (436)	61% (567)

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 embarrassed by their low levels of performance.	Provide students opportunities to work in multiple settings.	Intensive Reading Teachers	Guided and shared reading, Independent Literacy Exploration (ILE), creation of personal audio for books	Paired Reading, PodCasts.
2	Stamina	Chunking text	Intensive Reading Teachers	Expert groups jigsaw, power strategies, THIEVES.	Graphic organizers presentations
3	Distractions	Provide high-interest texts and student choice in reading materials.	Intensive Reading Teacher	Independent Reading Guides	End of book tests

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving within the lowest 25% from that of 57%

Reading Goal #4:			as shown on the 2012 FCAT to that of 62% as shown on the 2013 FCAT.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
57% (169)			62% (184)		

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	Cycle of defeat	Audio-book supported reading provides opportunities for success.	Intensive Reading Teachers	Observation	Product
2	Low attendance rates	Contact parents of absentees. Refer excessive absences to the Truancy Office for follow-up	Intensive Reading Teachers, Attendance Administrator	Phone logs, observation of student presence.	Attendance contract and attendance records.
3	Discipline	Teach character and behavior.	Intensive Reading Teachers	Observations	Student contracts

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 #
	52% of all students will make satisfory progress in Reading 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	47	52	57	61	66	

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 59% (78) Black: 34% (216) Hispanic: 48% (48) Asian: 41% (13) American Indian: N	White: 73% (97) Black: 43% (272) Hispanic: 59% (59) Asian: 48% (15) American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support at home	Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/inform parents in the intensive reading class.	Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance	Feedback from tutors	AVID, portfolios

2	Separation of Groups	Build community in the classroom	Intensive Reading Teachers	Observation of behavior in different student groupings; team-building activities (Minute to Win It)	Adherence to classroom rules, respect for one another.

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%(4)	33%(13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.C.1. Lack of support at home 5C.2. Separation of Groups	5.C.1. Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/inform parents in the intensive reading class. 5C.2. Build community in the classroom	5C.1. Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance counselors. 5C.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	5C.1. Feedback from tutors 5C..2. Observation of behavior in different student groupings; team building activities (Minute to Win It)	5C.1. AVID, portfolios 5C.2. Adherence to classroom rules respect for one another.

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(26)	29%(39)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.D.1. Lack of support at home	5.D.1. Provide additional school support and tutoring; seek to involve/inform parents in the intensive reading class. 5D.2. Build community in	5D.1. Intensive Reading Teachers, tutors, guidance counselors. 5D.2. Intensive Reading Teachers	5D.1. Feedback from tutors 5D..2. Observation of behavior in different student groupings; team building activities (Minute to Win It)	5D.1. AVID, portfolios 5D.2. Adherence to classroom rules respect for one another

		the classroom			
	5D.2. Separation of Groups				

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (401)	43%(522)

	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		We will target all students throughout the year for these subgroups: Words and Phrases, Compare and Contrast, Main Idea and Reference and Research	.Monitoring Team, PLC Team, Leaders and Department Head	1Each PLC will develop focus lessons/mini lessons and modify as needed. The targeted benchmarks will be selected based on noted progress on student work, assessments, and other relevant datum.	District Benchmark FAIR, formative and summative assessments.

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
Building Community within the classroom	9-12	Literacy Coach, reading Dept Chair	PLC members	Early Dismissal	Share best practices at subsequent meetings; classroom observations Collaboration during PLC Faculty Meetings	Literacy Coach Reading Department Chair
Collaborative planning iwth other schools	9-12	Reading Dept Chair Reading Coach	Reading Teachers/PLC members	Nov 2012 January 2013 March 2013	Share best practices at subsequent meetings; classroom observations Collaboration during PLC Faculty Meetings	Literacy coach, Reading Department Chair

Reading Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide students with choice in reading materials	Additional titles for classroom libraries	Internal	$1,000.00
		Subtotal:	$1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Build fluency through assisted reading	Read ALoud, CDs/Audio-books and headphones	Internal	$500.00
		Subtotal:	$500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
Grand Total: $1,500.00			

End of Reading Goa

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:	Progress to written control of the English language and expression of complex ideas required in modern text analysis.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

45%(35)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of cultural references to make language connections 1.2. Isolation in peer groups in unknown customs and peer groups 1.3.unfamilar materials, rituals and routines. Anticipated Barrier 2.1. Lack of confidence in written forms of expression in complex text in the English language.	1.1. Link to known language to new terms: Rosetta Stone and language emersion courses in Reading. 1.2. Seasonal and regional reading material; provide and create relevant reading materials 1.3. Alternative connection activities in a variety of performance assessments. Strategy 2.1. Scaffolded	1.1. ELL Support team 1.2. Reading/ ELL support teams 1.3. Reading Coach, ELL Administrator, ELL paraprofessionals. Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 2.1. ELL Support Team, Admin.	1.1.fluency and written tracking of words and phrases 1.2. formative sharing 1.3. A lessened dependence on phonetically spelled words. Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 2.1. Student data chats, tutoring sessions, abbreviated work with targeted paragraphs of concern.	1.1. Fluency tracker 1.2. project based compare/contrast 1.3.Student engagement in English language and informal chatter Evaluation Tool 2.1. essays and analyzed text 2.2.Student

2.2. Lack of cultural knowledge and making the connections found in embedded ELA courses.	exercises in writing and a comparison of literature of the native language to the new material 2.2. Non-fiction immersion to build background knowledge of periods of study for greater writing proficiency.	2.2. Ell Support, Team, paraprofessionals, Reading teachers and administrator	2.2. Student writes about newly integrated material with cultural connection for support and comparison/contrast.	creates his own KWL chart and adds to his own knowledge and expresses that in relevant comparisons and anecdotes in written material.

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:	Fully integration into honors courses and challenging coursework in the English courses.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

9%(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	2.1. Lack of confidence in written forms of expression in complex text in the English language. 2.2. Lack of cultural knowledge and making the connections found in embedded ELA courses.	2.1. Scaffolded exercises in writing and a comparison of literature of the native language to the new material 2.2. Non-fiction immersion to build background knowledge of periods of study for greater writing proficiency.	2.1. ELL Support Team, Admin. 2.2. Ell Support, Team, paraprofessionals, Reading teachers and administrator	2.1. Student data chats, tutoring sessions, abbreviated work with targeted paragraphs of concern. 2.2. Student writes about newly integrated material with cultural connection for support and comparison/contrast.	2.1. essays and analyzed text 2.2.Student creates his own KWL chart and adds to his own knowledge and expresses that in relevant comparisons and anecdotes in written material.

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:

14%(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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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 # 28% of the students will show proficiency in mathematics on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC and Geometry State EOC 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	20	28	35	42	49	

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students making that of 2012 Current Level of Performance as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 2013 Current Level of Performance as shown on the 2013 Algebra State EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 26%(19) Black: 60%(44) Hispanic: 4%(3) Asian: 5%(4) American Indian: 2%(1)	White: 31% (22) Black: 65%(47) Hispanic: 9%(7) Asian: 10%(8) American Indian: 7%(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	Lack of student motivation.	Develop an incentives program to promote 3 and above student performance .	Math coach Principal	Offer students who meet the standards an incentive (may be an honor roll, luncheon, name in yearbook) in honor of their achievements.	Benchmarks, mini assessments data Algebra I data

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

	5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	To increase the cross-cultural proficiency of ELL students to understand the words, used in math and in other courses, and apply those words accordingly to achieve the desired operations and results, particularly action verbs in math.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	93%(64)	98%(68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Unfamiliarity with the verbs and the ability to identify the verbs – which leads to confusion in answering the word problem questions.	Teaching the words needed for operations and explaining the part of speech – with repetition and practice. Provide pictures and manipulatives with accompanying vocabulary for ELL students Same language peer tutoring program to overcome teacher-student barriers When possible, provide students with native-language and English word problems to familiarize with vocabulary and concepts Reinforcement of basic skills through intensive math, hand's on practice and computer-aided practice.	Math department teachers, math coach, principal. Math department teachers, math coach, principal. Math department teachers Math department teachers and ELL specialists	Evaluation of student understanding through a variety of tests and vocabulary probing as evidenced on the TDL.	Mini Assessment and TDL

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:	To increase the proficiency of SWD students by
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(57)	76% (69)

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
	Mainstreaming Math Anxiety Lack of Pre-Req	Computerized and workbook practice Provide student success organizers for ESE students	Math Department Teachers Math Coach Principal ESE specialists	Mini Assessments Lab Work	Data Chats Progress monitoring Tool Peer to Peer Feedback

		Comply with student-specific IEPs to help students achieve success Provide large-print documents for visually impaired students			
1					

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:	Students will improve their proficiency level by 5%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (21)	31%(25)

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	Unfamiliarity with concepts and Pre-Re	Computerized and workbook practice Develop an incentives program to promote 3 and above student performance. School supply necessary tools for lower-income students to complete work Provide after-school tutoring for at-risk students, especially those who did not pass algebra I EOC	Math Department Teachers Math Coach Principal	Mini Assessments Lab work	Progress monitoring tool Progress reports

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(111)	67%(129)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments
2	1.2. Lack specialized instruction.	Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks	Progress on Mini-Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Algebra I State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Algebra I State EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(111)	67%(129)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments
2	Lack specialized instruction.	Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments

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:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Geometry State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Geometry State EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%(314)	67%(340)

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	1.1 Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	Focus Lessons to begin each day based on strands.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments
2	1.2 Lack specialized instruction.	Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks	Progress on Mini-Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in mathematics from that of 62% as shown on the 2012 Geometry State EOC to that of 67% as shown on the 2013 Geometry State EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(154)	67%(180)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack specialized instruction with rigor	Mini assessments administered after each focus lesson cycle to determine specific areas of concern.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments
2	1.4 Lack of prerequisite knowledge.	Focus Lessons based on strands and areas of concern.	Math Coach, Principal.	Classroom Observations, focused walks.	Progress on Mini-Assessments

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
Algebra I Data Analysis, Development of Focus Calendar	Algebra I	Math Coach	Algebra I PLC	PLC meetings each Wednesday	Meeting minutes/ class data/ lesson plans/classroom observations	Math Coach, Math Department Chair, Principal
Targeted Strand Instruction	Algebra I	Math Coach	Algebra I PLC	PLC meetings each Wednesday	Meeting minutes/ class data/ lesson plans/classroom observations	Math Coach, Math Department Chair, Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide Students with Calculators	Calculators		$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
</table>

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

No Data Submitted

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in science from that of 35% as shown on the 2012 FCAT to that of 40% as shown on the 2013 State Biology I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (213)	40% (244)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
</table>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inadequate labs for hands on activities due to temporary housing situation with portables.	Develop a plan to share formal lab space between biology classes	Affected teachers	All classes getting to share in use of formal lab space	Lab summaries
2	Require more expendable lab materials	Order necessary materials	Biology teachers, department chair	Hands-on activities with students	Lab summaries.
3	Limited content knowledge.	Instructional focus lessons.	Instructional coach	Exit slips, cohort teacher meetings, PLC collaboration	Tests, benchmarks (or equivalent), common assessments, formative testing

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
Data Analysis	9-12 Science PLC	Instructional Coach TFA colleagues District coach	Science PLC	Early DismissalScience TDE days	Weekly and quarterly PLC meetings	Instructional ccoach and PLC administration
Reading Strategies across content areas	9-12 Science	Instructional Coach	Science PLC	Early Release	Weekly classroom visits	Instructional coach and SLC administration
Content focus lessons	Biology teachers	Instructional coach	Biology science teachers	Early Dismissal Days	Weekly classroom visits	Instructional coach

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Research paper evaluation for plagiarism and grammar check	TUrn-It-In	Internal	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instructional days for biology teachers	TDE for biology teachers	SAI	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
JU Science and Math Engineering Day and science related field trips	Provide Buses for participating students	Internal	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Writing Goal #1A: Robert E. Lee High School will increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in writing from that of 89% scoring 3.0 and above on the 2012 FCAT Writes to that of 94% scoring 3.0 and above on the 2013 FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (501)	94% (530)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. With changes to the FCAT Writes evaluation system, we anticipate grammar, spelling, and mechanic errors will cost some students a full score level.	1.1. ELA will pilot new writing process strategies to raise student awareness of common grammatical, spelling, and mechanical errors. (mini-lessons and heuristics on homophone errors.)	ELA Department Chair during PLCs	Evaluation of student performance for common grammatical, spelling, and mechanical errors.	District/Lee Writes, ELA PLC
2	Transitions: The FCAT Writes rubric differentiates scores of 1, 2, and 3 from 4 through the effective and non-effective use of transitions.	Mini-lessons and common assessments that intentionally reward students for the effective use of transitions.	Social Studies and ELA Department Chairs	Transitions positively affects writing scores in all kinds of writing. Therefore, a full implementation of strategy may be executed. Results should show improvement across disciplines in social studies, sciences, and English.	Cross-curricular (cross PLC) sharing of student writing to allow social studies/science faculty. ELA writing assignments that double as science/social studies assignment.
3	Elaboration: The skill of elaborative support is most heavily weighted in FCAT Writes essay scoring (Focus = 1 point; Organization = 1 point; Conventions = 1 point; Support = 3 points)	Anchor sets allow students to examine and to score high-performing and low-performing essays; students should work at grading anchor sets as well as improving individual supporting paragraphs of anchor sets. Both ELA and Social Studies have a vested interest in training students	PLC leaders	Teachers will grade Support as a separate category apart from an overall score of each essay. We will monitor scores for improvement.	Cross-curricular (cross PLC) sharing of student writing to allow social studies/science faculty. ELA writing assignments that double as science/social studies assignment.

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

in need of improvement for the following group:

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Word walls/Vocabulary Lessons	9-10 ELA	Instructional Coach	School-wide faculty	Faculty Meetings	Classroom Walk-Throughs	Design Team
Teacher Transitions	9-10 ELA	PLC Leaders ELA Dept Teachers Instrucitonal Coach	ELA and Social Studies Teachers	Instructional Days-November	Classroom Walk-throughs	Design Team
Facilitating Writing Conferences	9-10 ELA	PLC leaders ELA Dept teachers Instructional Coach	ELA and Social Studies Teachers	Instructional Days-November	Classroom Walk-throughs	Design Team

Writing Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Attendance Goal #1: Robert E. Lee High School will increase its attendance rate from 90% to 95% in 2012. In addition, Robert E. Lee High School will reduce the number of students with excessive absences from 105 in 2012 to 90 in 2013, as well as reduce the number of students with excessive tardies from 280 in 2012 to 200 in 2013.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

90% (1626)	95%(1716)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
105	90
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
280	200

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of updated demographic information on students.	Have students correct Demographics each semester. coach teachers in methods of monitoring of sutdent attendance (call home after 3 days out) and methods to engage students when they are in class.	APO	Increased contact with parents/guardians.	Increased accountability for absences/excuses received.
2	Lack of concern by parents and students to maintain high levels of school attendance.	Professional Development for Parents.	Administrative Team	Attendance Rate will Increase.	Attendance Rate increase

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
GPA Action Plan incorporates attendance as of it components	9-12	Attendance Assitant Principal	PLCs for 9th grade teams	Pre-Planning, PLCs	Tardy System/Consequences	Assistant Principals

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Robert E. Lee High School will strive to reduce the number of instances of in-school suspension from 1806 in 2012 to 1686 in 2013. In addition, the school will strive to reduce the number of instances of out-of-school suspension from 280 in 2012 to 267 in 2013.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1806	1686
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1806	1686
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
280	267
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
280	267

	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, especially 9th graders, are	Students will be taught discipline requirements	Assistant Principal-	Administrative observations of classes	Quizzes, exit interviews in

1	unaware of discipline policy in high school	during the first week in all classes using Foundations lessons	Foundations; classroom teachers.	during Foundations lessons.	classes following Foundations instruction.
2	Parents unaware of ATOSS alternative to OSS.	Include ATOSS materials in initial student/parent packet on school day 1.	Assistant Principals	APSS's assign students to ATOSS upon suspension as standard policy rather than OSS.	Increased ATOSS enrollment
3	Student Apathy and resistance of structure.	School Powerpoint admin/teacher chats	Assistnat Principals	Tardy System	Essays on Topics

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention	
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Robert E. Lee High School will strive to reduce its dropout rate during the 2012-2013 school year from the previous 4.8% to 4.0%. Robert E. Lee High School will increase its graduation rate from 82.8% in 2012 to 92.8% in 2013.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
4.8 % (26)	4.0% (21)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
72.8% (259)	82.8% (263)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack vision for their futures	Incorporate future planning in day-to-daconversation/lessons/mentoring.y	Guidance Counselors	Track transcript requests.	Senior Exit surveys.

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
Creating a COllege Going Culture	9-12/All	SLC Leaders	School-wide	SLC meetings	Classroom observations, student conversations	Administrative team

---

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Robert E. Lee High School will increase the level of parent participation in school activities from 30% in 2012 to 50% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
30%	50%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Opportunity	Provide alternative meeting times	Principal PTSA President	Sign-in Sheets	Exit Slips and Surveys
2	Topics do not meet parents' needs	Survey parent needs and interests. Incorporate additional courses in community education program.	Assistant Principals, Community Ed Supervisor	Exit Slips; Post-Survey Results	Increased attendance.
3	Lack of advertising and information to parents.	Post information to website in timely manner. Provide quarterly newsletters and calendar of events	Assistant Principals	Sign-in Sheets	Increased attendance, Survey Results.

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
Increasing Parent Involvement at the Clssroom Level	9-12 All	SLC Leadaers	SLC groups	Bi-monthly faculty meetings	Check teacher websites for increased information	SLC leaders

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Resource Center	Educational Materials for Parent Use	Title 1	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

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:	Link the student experience in the classroom with the real world as engineers. Develop a sense of urgency for students to understand the role of Engineers in the world. Connect the curriculum to the expectations of college performance. Recertification of SEAM

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		Utilizing the PSAT, ACT, and SAT scores to improve student performance and course selection process	Guidance Counselor	PSAT scores, progress monitoring of grades and performance,progress reports, mini meetings Peer to peer contact Mentors	Progress Reports, test scores
		Utilizing network of	Administration	Mentorship Action Plan	Student data

2		professional contacts/mentorship projects	Lead Teacher Engineer Advisory board	Advisory Board Meetings	Meeting minutes

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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	To provide relevant content that links hands-on experiences with workforce skills and student enrichment in an academic setting. The primary goal is for students to gain an industry certification in a path of interest and study. These industry certifications will help build

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1:				confidence, secure skills and provide a base for the work ethic and knowledge range that employer's value in a postsecondary environment. The end result is a fully entwined program that allows students informed choices at the highest possible skill levels to be innovative leaders and contributing employees, particularly in area and state-wide employment sectors.	

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 unfamiliarity with job choices and the certifications that are available. Lack of experiences in CTE industries. Structuring a curriculum that is deep enough to be valuable in skill and in critical thinking skills while providing real-world experiences and authentic tasks.	1.1. KWL activities and research projects to familiarize the students with various industries and the academic connection. Guest speakers. Exposure to new industries through authentic learning experiences with industry field trips and peer competitions. Compare curriculums of similar programs and customize the needs of our programs and evaluate the program goals with state standards and benchmarks to ensure maximum rigor and relevance.	Lead teachers Lead teachers; Assistant Principals Lead Teachers and CTE teams.	Teacher evaluation of student work and the student's ability to verbally and in written form express his opinions and knowledge about new areas of interest and the pre-requisites required for success. Debriefing sessions and written responses to what was learned. Results on the industry certification tests and student surveys.	Student projects and progressive journals and presentations. In-depth journals and formative class discussions. Meeting notes, strategies, and brainstorming charts. Compare and contrast measurement charts and alignment audit by program.

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
CTE training for tracking	9-12	Administrator	PLC, District Coaches	09/06/2012	contact with District Office and weeking meetings with district liaisons	CTE Administrator

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)

NA Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of NA Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide students with choice in reading materials	Additional titles for classroom libraries	Internal	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Resource Center	Educational Materials for Parent Use	Title 1	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $2,000.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Build fluency through assisted reading	Read ALoud, CDs/Audio-books and headphones	Internal	$500.00
Mathematics	Provide Students with Calculators	Calculators		$1,000.00
Science	Research paper evaluation for plagiarism and grammar check	TUrn-It-In	Internal	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,500.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Instructional days for biology teachers	TDE for biology teachers	SAI	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	JU Science and Math Engineering Day and science related field trips	Provide Buses for participating students	Internal	$400.00
				Subtotal: $400.00
				Grand Total: $3,900.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

⌨ Priority	⌨ Focus	⌨ Prevent	⌨ NA

Are you a reward school: ⌨ Yes ⌨ No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC conducts monthly SAC meetings and a midyear Stakeholder Assessments. In addition, coordination for the recommended amount of area SAC meetings will be held with the middle and elementary schools in our area.	$0.00

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

SAC funds are being used for the School Improvement Plan, by request from faculty and staff.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
ROBERT E. LEE HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	37%	69%	82%	35%	223	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	48%	75%			123	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	49% (NO)	59% (YES)			108	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					454	
Percent Tested = 94%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
ROBERT E. LEE HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	31%	63%	86%	37%	217	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	37%	66%			103	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	35% (NO)	61% (YES)			96	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					416	
Percent Tested = 94%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested