FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PINE VIEW SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Steven Largo

SAC Chair: Mark Mason, Andrea Chu

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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	Steven Largo	BA in Science MA in Education - Administration and Supervision Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction Certification in Biology (grades 6-12), Chemistry (grades 6-12), General Science (grades 5-9), Gifted Endorsement, Middle Grades	25	34	Principal of Pine View School 2010-2011: Grade "pending" - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 78% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 85% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 100% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2009-2010: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 81% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 84% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2008-2009: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 76% made learning gains in Reading

		Endorsement, School Principal (all levels)			- %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 83% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 96%
Assis Principal	Jennifer Freeman	BA History and Secondary Social Science Education MA Educational Leadership Certification in Social Studies grades 6-12, Administration, Exceptional Student Education, and Gifted Endorsed	3	2	2010-2011: Grade "pending" - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 78% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 85% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 100% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2009-2010: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 81% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 84% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2008-2009: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 76% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 83% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 96%
Assis Principal	Sue Fair	BS in Special Education MA Educational Leadership Certification in SLD and Behavior Disorders (Special Education), ESOL, and Administration	1	5	2010-2011: Grade "pending" - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 78% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 85% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 100% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2009-2010: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 81% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 84% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2008-2009: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 76% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 83% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 96%
Assis Principal	Jennifer Nzeza	BA in Secondary Social Science Education, MA in Curriculum and Instruction, and Ed.S in Educational Leadership Certified in English 5-9, Social Studies 5-9, National Board Certification, Gifted Endorsed	2	1	2010-2011: Grade "pending" - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 78% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 85% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 100% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2009-2010: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 81% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 84% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2008-2009: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 76% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 83% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 96%
					2010-2011: Grade "pending"

					- %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 78% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 85% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 100% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2009-2010: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 81% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 84% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 97% 2008-2009: Grade A - %Meeting high standards in Reading: 99%; 76% made learning gains in Reading - %Meeting high standards in Math: 100%; 83% made learning gains in Math - %Meeting high standards in writing; 99% - %Meeting high standards in Science; 96%
Assis Principal	Lisa Wheatley	BS in Elementary Education MA in Educational Leadership Certified in Elementary Education, Reading Endorsement	1	2	

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)
	NONE AT THIS TIME				

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	SCIP (Sarasota County Induction Program) Mentors for beginning teachers	Lead SCIP Mentor	On-going	
2	Develop leadership capacity through instructional coaching and professional development	Principal and Assistant Principals	On-going	
3	Hire highly-qualified teachers	Principal	On-going	

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
137	4.4%(6)	16.1%(22)	46.0%(63)	27.7%(38)	83.9%(115)	0.0%(0)	2.2%(3)	9.5%(13)	21.9%(30)

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
Tara Spielman	David Nezelek	First year teacher; Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Stacey Chaillou	Angela Keiper-Wilson	First year teacher; Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Robin Ringo	Nadine Moschberger	Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Leslie Chase	Lynn Halcomb	General support	Assistance as needed
Linda Lyons	Kristin Snowdon	General support	Assistance as needed
Patti Gerlek	Kristin Guay	Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Hali Flahavan	Karen Cangero	Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Sharyn Jankovsky	Cynthia Wozniak	Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Lyna Ruiz	Tonya Johnson	First year teacher; Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed
Kyla Quinn	Tanya Villacis	First year teacher; Subject-specific and General support	Assistance as needed

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based RtI Leadership team is comprised of the following personnel:
Grade 2-5 - Lisa Wheatley, Elementary Assistant Principal; Mary Cantillo, Elementary School Counselor
Grade 6/7 - Sue Fair, Assistant Principal; Kate McManus, School Counselor
Grade 8/9 - Jennifer Nzeza, Assistant Principal; Lynn Halcomb, School Counselor
Grade 10-12 - Jennifer Freeman, Assistant Principal; Connie Swikle, School Counselor
All Grades - Tim Gissal, School Psychologist; Diane Andrew, Occupational Therapist; Ileen Issac, Speech-Language Clinician;
Linda Lyons, ESE Liaison; Valerie Barker, ESE Liaison

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 MTSS Leadership Team meets to formally collaborate as a School-Wide Support Team either once per week (elementary) or twice monthly (middle/high). Guidance counselors set the agenda for SWST meetings. Summative and formative data are examined to identify school, class, or individual student needs relative to attendance, behavior, and/or academics. Discussions also focus on the implementation of interventions and progress monitoring. If necessary, students of concern are brought up to Children At Risk in Education (CARE).

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 MTSS Leadership Team provides pertinent data related to attendance, behavior, and academics.

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 school uses a variety of reports produced by the district Office of Research, Assessment, and Evaluation (RAE) on the academic achievement of students, including disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, math, science, and writing. Additional sources include at each tier include FOCUS, classroom, benchmark and End of Course assessment data provided by the district.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> Tim Gissal, school psychologist, has attended grade-level professional learning communities to answer questions relating to MTSS. He will also be available on our first professional day to train teachers needing further assistance. In addition, Assistant Principals assist teachers in PLCs as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> As described above, Pine View administrators and the school psychologist will assist teachers in MTSS. In addition, a team of teachers from grades 2-12 and in all content areas will be trained in Differentiated Instruction this school year. This team will facilitate staff understanding and implementation of differentiation - a essential component of MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The Literacy Leadership Team includes the following personnel:
> Assistant Principal, Jennifer Nzeza
> Lance Bergman, Social Studies (HS)
> Stacey Chaillou, Science (MS)
> Tara Speilman, Math (MS)
> Faith McClellan, Math(HS)
> Brigid Shannon, English (HS)
> Lori Moyer, English (MS)
> Kristin Snowdon, ESE (MS-HS)
> Kyla Quinn, Language Arts (ELM)
> Jo Davidsmeyer, Librarian (ELM,MS,HS)

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

> The Literacy Leadership Team identifies and promotes teaching strategies that strengthen literacy across all subject areas. Members model and disseminate content-relevant strategies during faculty meetings, professional learning communities and team or department meetings. In addition, the LLT supports Pine View's Common Core Curriculum initiative. Team meetings are held once a month.

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

Major initiatives include:
-Support of the Common Core Curriculum initiative
-Institute a school-wide vocabulary/word parts program
-Create a series of professional development segments online through Angel Learn
-Build capacity of teachers in the use of teaching strategies that strengthen literacy
-Increase membership

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Teachers at Pine View will work in Collaborative Planning Teams to design standards-based lesson plans and monitor student progress in reading. They will use technology tools to engage students in rigorous, relevant, and aligned curriculum activities in reading. Pine View's Common Core Committee will expose teachers to the Common Core State Standards, assist them in "unpacking" them, and model strategies for aiding students in accessing, processing, and communicating the information they read. Teachers will complete individual professional development as designated in their Individual Professional Development Plans.

*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?

Pine View offers an Externship class which allows students to partner with a professional mentor in a field of interest.
Students and mentors organize a schedule which ensures maximum exposure to real-world application of work in the field.

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?

Grade-level Guidance Counselors organize:
Small group sessions for career planning in grades 8-9;
Small group sessions which combine academic and career planning in grade 10;
Individual sessions with grades 11-12

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

Pine View offers a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Club and added a Microsoft Career Academy course for Career and Technical Education.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 8%(127) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(1673)	Level 3 - 8% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 92%(1546) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(1673)	Level 4,5 - 92% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Performance Assessments, Collection, and Analysis	Staff will collaborate to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 three times per year.	Principals, Assistant Principals, Reading/Language Arts Department Chairs	Data reports including FAIR, common assessments, running records, profolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, and/or FCAT Explorer will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(1213)	82%

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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-	Principal, Assistant Principals, District	Classroom observation data which indicates an	Observation data; surveys

2	strategies in classrooms	12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies	DI Trainers	increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	

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:

<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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84%(336)	88%

<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
	Increasing the access to and level of high-	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee,	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy	Monitor participation in professional development	Professional development

1	complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
3	Increasing the use of small group instruction based on data	Provide professional development or teacher models to increase level of awareness and implementation of small groups	Principal, Assistant Principals, DI Team (where appropriate)	Classroom observation data indicating an increased use in small group instruction	Observation data
4	Instructional materials and resources	Collaborative planning teams will design differentiated instructional strategies (including MTSS interventions) to improve deficient skills for our lowest 25%	Principal, Assistant Principal, Collaborative Planning Teams	Administrators will monitor lesson plans/lesson delivery during classroom walkthroughs for differentiated instructional strategies`	Collaborative Planning meeting notes and assessment data

---

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 #
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	99	99	99	99	99	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 99%(1335) Hispanic 98%(81) Black 100%(14) Asian 99%(152)	White 99% Met AMO Target Hispanic 100% Black 100% Met AMO Target Asian 99% Met AMO Target

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

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
93%	100%

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	99% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC focus will be on building awareness of Common Core State Standards; implementing strategies related to Team Leader & Department Chair initiatives, and differentiated instructional strategies	Grades 2-12, All content areas	Team Leaders, Department Chairs, Common Core Committee, Literacy Team	Grades 2-12, All content areas	Common Core Awareness: August, October 26th, January 22nd, March 29th Strategies: ongoing	Team Leader & Department Chair meeting discussions; feedback from staff;	Principal, Assistant Principals, Common Core Committee, Department Chairs, Team Leaders
Differentiated Instruction training	Grades 2-12, All content areas	Kelly Ellington	Grades 2-12, All content areas	September 7th October 25th, 26th January 22nd, 23rd	Teachers will implement DI in their classrooms; facilitate discussion during PLCs; support teachers who are interested in trying DI in their classrooms	Principal, Assistant Principals, DI Team
Advanced Placement training in vertical teaming	English Department	Advanced Placement Trainers/English Chair	PLC participants	January 22nd or March 28=9th	PLC meeting minutes; lesson plans	English Chair; Assistant Principals
Developing the English scope and sequence to align with Common Core State Standards and incorporate the new vocabulary materials	English Department	English Chair	PLC participants	Ongoing	PLC meeting minutes; lesson plans	English Chair; Assistant Principals

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

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

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

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 8%(93) Level 3,4,5 - 99%(1232)	Level 3 - 8% Level 3,4,5 - 99%

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	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
3	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 92%(1139) Level 3,4,5 - 99% (1232)	Level 4,5 - 92% Level 3,4,5 - 99%

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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	

Mathematics Goal #2b:

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
85% (912)	87%

	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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting

3		teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels			notes

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

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

<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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
3	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (234)	87%

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
				Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
3	Increasing the use of small group instruction based on data	Provide professional development or teacher models to increase level of awareness and implementation of small groups	Principal, Assistant Principals, DI Team (where appropriate)	Classroom observation data indicating an increased use in small group instruction	Observation data
4	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

---

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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #
	5A : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	99	100	100	100	100	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian 100% Black 100%	Asian 100% Met AMO Target Black 100% Met AMO Target

Hispanic 95%
White 100%

Hispanic 100%
White 100% Met AMO Target

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

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

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
98%	100%

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population.

satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5E:

The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
99%	100%

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
	Alignment of the curriculum map to	Continue to align the curriculum map to	Principal, Assistant Principals,	Data reports from common assessments,	Assessment reports and

2	Common Core State Standards	Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Elementary Leaders and teachers	running records, portfolios, etc.	Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

	level of student performance	texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas			

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

	performance	areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas			
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
3	Increasing the use of small group instruction based on data	Provide professional development or teacher models to increase level of awareness and implementation of small groups	Principal, Assistant Principals, DI Team (where appropriate)	Classroom observation data indicating an increased use in small group instruction	Observation data

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal #
The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is 5A : |
|---|---|

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	99	100	100	100	100	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian 100%
Black 100%
Hispanic 95%
White 100% | Asian 100% Met AMO Target
Black Met AMO Target
Hispanic 100%
White 100% Met AMO Target |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
98%	100%

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
99%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

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:

<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
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:

<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
No Data Submitted				

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

in need of improvement for the following group:

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

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 2%(4) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(232)	Level 3 - 6% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

		year.		Community (PLC) meetings.	
2	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 98%(228) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(232)	Level 4,5 - 98% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	100	100	100	100	100	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian 100% Black 100% Hispanic 95% White 100%	Asian 100% Met AMO Target Black 100% Met AMO Target Hispanic 100% White 100% Met AMO Target

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

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

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

98%	100%

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
99%	100%

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Collection of and timely access to formative	Administrative staff will work with RAE to	Principal, Assistant	Data reports including district and teacher-	Assessment reports and

			Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers		Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
1	(benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by	Geometry Goal # [text box]

50%.   3A :

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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
Differentiated Instruction training	Grades 2-12, All content areas	Kelly Ellington	Grades 2-12, All contents	September 7th, October 25th, 26th January 22nd, 23rd	Teachers will implement DI in their classrooms; faciliate discussion during PLCs; support teachers who are interested in trying DI in their classrooms	Principal, Assistant Principals, DI Team
PLC focus on building awareness of Common Core State Standards; implementing strategies related to increasing rigor	Grades 2-12, All content areas	PLC leader	Grades 2-12, All contents	ongoing	PLC meeting notes	Assistant Principals, PLC leaders

Mathematics Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 30% (122) Level 3,4,5 - 98% (401)	Level 3 - 34% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark) assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

		sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.		collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	
2	Alignment of the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards	Continue to align the curriculum map to Common Core State Standards; 5th grade teachers will meet once per month to ensure they are providing grade-level appropriate tasks for all grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Elementary Leaders and teachers	Data reports from common assessments, running records, portfolios, etc.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
3	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 68% (279) Level 3,4,5 - 98% (401)	Level 4,5 - 72% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to: provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core Curriculum Committee, Teachers	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from teachers; analyze performance data	Professional development surveys; performance data
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Increasing the access to and level of high-complexity texts within all content areas; providing relevant	Utilize the Literacy Team, Common Core Committee, and Differentiated Instruction Team to:	Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Team, Common Core	Monitor participation in professional development within the district or school; review feedback from	Professional development surveys; performance data

1	professional development to teachers; increasing or maintaining current level of student performance	provide professional development and/or assist teachers in accessing challenging texts across subject areas; model use of literacy strategies in content areas	Curriculum Committee, Teachers	teachers; analyze performance data	
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.

Biology Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark) assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

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

| 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
PLC focus will be on blending and aligning Sunshine State Standards with Common Core State Standards; using common vocabulary strategies; and developing strategies for analyzing complex text and notetaking	Science Department, all grade levels	Science Chair/PLC leader	PLC members	Ongoing	PLC meeting notes, lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principals, Science Department Chair

Science Budget:

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

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
99%(598)	99%

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	Continued implementation of best practices for teaching writing	Utilize Collaborative Learning time to discuss the development of writing elements and analyze writing data; use mock FCAT Writing prompts 4 times per year at all levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Language Arts Department Chair, Collaborative Learning Leader	Review mock FCAT Writing prompts and collaboration notes; FCAT data	Mock FCAT Writing prompts; FCAT data
2	Understanding the changes in the FCAT Writing test	Train teachers in the changes and techniques for addressing them	Principal, Assistant Principals, Language Arts Department Chair, Collaborative Learning Leader	FCAT Writing scores, collaboration (PLC) notes	FCAT writing scores

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	86%(517)		88%		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Continued implementation of best practices for teaching writing	Utilize Collaborative Learning time to discuss the development of writing elements and analyze writing data; use mock FCAT Writing prompts 4 times per year at all levels	Principal, Assistant Principals, Language Arts Department Chair, Collaborative Learning Leader	Review mock FCAT Writing prompts and collaboration notes; FCAT data	Mock FCAT Writing prompts; FCAT data
2	Understanding the changes in the FCAT Writing test	Train teachers in the changes and techniques for addressing them	Principal, Assistant Principals, Language Arts Department Chair, Collaborative Learning Leader	FCAT Writing scores, collaboration (PLC) notes	FCAT writing scores

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
District Writing Training	8,9,10 English	Kelly Ellington & Patti Brustad	English teachers grades 8,9,10	October 9th-10th, 2012	Teachers will share pertinent information with departments/teams during Collaborative Planning Meetings	8,9,10 English teachers

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Mapping the new Civics curriculum; developing relevant lessons and activities from new materials	Work collaboratively during PLCs to plan lessons and activities as well as map the new curriculum	Principal, Assistant Principals, Social Studies Department Chairs, Civics teachers	PLC meeting notes, lesson plans, EOC data	PLC meeting notes, lesson plans, EOC data

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mapping the new Civics curriculum; developing relevant lessons and activities from new materials	Work collaboratively during PLCs to plan lessons and activities as well as map the new curriculum	Principal, Assistant Principals, Social Studies Department Chairs, Civics teachers	PLC meeting notes, lesson plans, EOC data	PLC meeting notes, lesson plans, EOC data
2	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC focus will be on creating common assessments; developing the curriculum map; creating relevant and challenging lesson plans and activities	7th grade Civics	PLC Leader	Civics teachers	Twice a month during PLCs	Lesson plans; common assessments; curriculum map	Principal, Assistant Principals, PLC Leaders, Civics teachers

Civics Budget:

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

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

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
1	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes
2	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
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
1	Increasing the use of Differentiated Instruction strategies in classrooms	Train a small group of teachers from grades 3-12 in Differentiated Instruction strategies; use these teachers to model successful DI strategies for other teachers	Principal, Assistant Principals, District DI Trainers	Classroom observation data which indicates an increased use in DI strategies in the DI Team's classrooms	Observation data; surveys
2	Collection of and timely access to formative (benchmark)assessment data; Timely analysis of data; Ability to use the data to drive instruction	Administrative staff will work with RAE to provide teachers with data in as timely a manner as possible; Staff will collaborate during grade-level or department PLCs to monitor progress using multiple data sources/assessments in grades 3 through 10 at least three times per year.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chairs, Teachers	Data reports including district and teacher-created common assessments, running records, portfolios, Florida Achieves, FOCUS, FCAT Explorer, and/or EOC assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning and through Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings.	Assessment reports and Collaborative Planning Meeting notes

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC focus will be on building awareness of Common Core State Standards; implementing strategies related to Team Leader and Department Chair	Social Studies department	Team Leaders, Department Chair, PLC leaders	Social Studies Teachers	Common Core Awareness: August, October 26th, January 27th, March 29th Strategies: ongoing	PLC meeting minutes	Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Chair, PLC leaders

initiatives

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 – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage. ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease . ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.6% (2110/2184)	98.6%

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
	671	627
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
	0	0

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Immediacy of initiating appropriate truancy procedures when needed	School staff will collaborate to monitor individual students	Attendance officer, School Wide Support Team members, teachers	RAE Profile report, AS400, MTSS documentation	Attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training in use of CrossPoint for new teachers; review steps for initiating truancy procedures when needed	All grade levels/subject areas	Technology Support, PLC leaders, Counselors, School Wide Support Team	School wide as needed	Ongoing	MTSS documentation, SWST notes, AS400, RAE profile report	Principal, Assistant Principals, Collaborative Planning Teams, School Wide Support Team, Counselors

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
3	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
16	16
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
10	10

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
	Progress monitoring, data collection, and interventions to follow the Response to Intervention model	Collaborative planning team will identify intervention strategies to address student social, emotional, and	School Counselors, School Wide Support Team, School	RtI portfolios	RAE Reports

		behavioral needs, which may include mentoring, skill training, classroom management techniques, small group, or individual counseling	Psychologist, Teachers, Collaborative Planning Team		
1					

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:

Dropout Goal

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	For the School year 2012-2013, there will be a reduction in the percent of students who dropout of school. If the current dropout rate is 2.5 or higher, there will be a .4 percent reduction. If the current dropout rate is less than 2.5, there will be a .2 percent reduction. Graduation Goal For the school year 2012-2013, the percentage of students graduating from high school will increase. If the current graduation rate is less than 84 percent, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point increase for all subgroups. If the current graduation rate is 84 percent or higher, there will be a 2 percentage point increase.	

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
0.0%	0.0%

2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
0	0

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	84% of all parents will attend parent orientation nights (Open House) on August 30, 2012 and September 6, 2012.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
The method through which we report parental involvement is through total parent volunteer hours = 38,387	Total parent volunteer hours = 39,922

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase enrollments for non-traditional students in Microsoft Career Academy, AP Computer Science, and the future Applied Robotics course by 10%.

	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	Resources and student perceptions	Collaboration across grade levels on Science/STEM project	Principal, Assistant Principals	Classroom ASsessments, Meeting minutes	Classroom assessments and meeting minutes
2	Student and parent knowledge of courses	Develop marketing materials for prospective students and parents	Principal, Assistant Principals, STEM teachers	Increased enrollment in courses	Marketing materials
3	Student and parent knowledge and perception of courses	Work with guidance counselors to ensure they understand and support the specific STEM program and/or Academy	Principal, Assistant Principals, teachers	Increased enrollment in courses	Increased enrollment

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
Project-based learning training for teachers	High School/STEM classes	PLC leaders	PLC participants	PLC meetings	PLC minutes	Principal, Assistant Principals, PLC leaders

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase enrollments for non-traditional students in Microsoft Career Academy, AP Computer Science, and the future Applied Robotics course by 10%.
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	Resources and student perceptions	Add a Microsoft Career Academy for 7th and 8th grade	Principals, Assistant Principals	Evaluate industry certifications, new enrollment, and re-	Industry exam

				enrollment	
2	Student and parent knowledge of courses	Develop marketing materials for prospective students and parents	Principal, Assistant Principals, CTE teachers	Increased enrollment in courses	Marketing materials
3	Student and parent knowledge and perception of courses	Work with guidance counselors to ensure they understand and support the specific CTE program and/or Academy	Principal, Assistant Principals, teachers	Increased enrollment in courses	Increased enrollment in courses

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
Microsoft Career Academy Training	7th and 8th grade CTE	Microsoft Career Academy Trainer	7th and 8th grade CTE teachers	ongoing	Lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principals, CTE teachers

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)

N/A 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 N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

◯ 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 (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds are projected to be used for school improvement initiatives, including but not limited to Differentiated Instruction, Common Core State Standards, and Sustainability@Pine View.	$7,500.00

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

SAC will be involved in the organization of a school-wide assembly in April.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District
PINE VIEW SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	99%	100%	100%	97%	396	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	78%	85%			163	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?	96% (YES)	100% (YES)			196	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					755	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District
PINE VIEW SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	99%	100%	99%	97%	395	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	81%	84%			165	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?	97% (YES)	98% (YES)			195	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					755	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested