# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PINE RIDGE ALTERNATIVE CENTER

District Name: Broward

Principal: Belinda Hope

SAC Chair: Lakeisha Flint

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2011-2012 was Ms. Hope's first year at Pine Ridge Education Center. The first year ended with the school receiving a NR (not rated), because the testing pool fell short of the amount required for district data. However, there were significant learning gains in each subject area.<br>During the 2010-2011, Ms. Hope was the Assistant Principal at Bair Middle School. While she was responsible for Language Arts, the writing scores improved from 88% in 2010 to 90% in 2011 of students meeting high standards in writing. Prior to that, she was the Assistant Principal at Lauderdale Lakes Middle School. Under her Leadership, Lauderdale Lakes Middle School moved from a D in 2006-2007, to a C in 2007- 2008, to a final grade of B during the 2008- 2009 school year. While Ms. Hope supervised the Language Arts Department their scores rose from 75% of the students meeting high scores in writing in 2005-2006 to 93% in 2008-2009. The total population has shown a steady |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Belinda Hope | Masters of Education in Educational Leadership and a Bachelors of Arts in English from Florida A&M University. Certifications: School Principal (all levels), Educational Leadership (all levels), and English (grades 5-9) | 2 | 7 | improvement during the school years that she was in administration: Percent of students scoring at or above grade level in Reading - 45% in 2007, 47% in 2008, 49% in 2009, and 51% in 2010. Percent of students scoring at or above grade level in Math - 44% in 2007, 49% in 2008, 50% in 2009, and 51% in 2010. Percent of students scoring below grade level in Reading - 55% in 2007, 53% in 2008, 51% in 2009, and 49% in 2010. Percent of students scoring below grade level in Math - 56% in 2007, 51% in 2008, 50% in 2009, and 49% in 2010. The Black population has shown a steady improvement during the school years that she was in administration: Percent of students scoring at or above grade level in Reading - 43% in 2007, 44% in 2008, 47% in 2009, and 49% in 2010. Percent of students scoring at or above grade level in Math - 41% in 2007, 46% in 2008, 48% in 2009, and 49% in 2010. Percent of students scoring below grade level in Reading - 57% in 2007, 56% in 2008, 53% in 2009, and 51% in 2010. Percent of students scoring below grade level in Math - 59% in 2007, 54% in 2008, 52% in 2009, and 51% in 2010.<br>Ms. Hope was also responsible for 3 ELO (Extended Learning Opportunities) programs for students. She spearheaded 1. Workout Wednesday FCAT Session (focused on students who did not score well on a specific strand/benchmark), 2. Afterschool TAL FCAT Program (focused on students who scored in the lowest 25%), and 3. Saturday Express FCAT Camp (focused on students who scored a high level 2 or low level 3). As a result, 61% of the students involved in ELO either made a learning gain or increased an achievement level in math and or reading. In addition, Ms. Hope was the Curriculum Specialist at Sunrise Middle School where her responsibilities ranged from curriculum and training to discipline and operational management. She was a vital figure in the school moving from a C in 2000-2001 to a B in 2002-2003. |
| Assis Principal | Jon Feldman | Bachelors of Science in Political Science, Barry University & Master in Educational Leadership, Florida Atlantic University Certified in Social Sciences 5-9 & Educational Leadership K-12 | 7 | 7 | Pine Ridge Education Center<br>Grade: Not Rated (2011-2012)<br>Reading Leaning Gains: No data to report<br>Math Learning Gains: No data to report<br>Writing Proficiency: No data to report<br>Science Proficiency: No data to report<br>AYP was not met.<br>Grade: Declining (2010-2011)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 50%<br>Math Learning Gains: 64%<br>Writing Proficiency: 94%<br>Science Proficiency: 4%<br>Grade: Not Rated (2009-2010)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 42%<br>Math Learning Gains: 48%<br>Writing Proficiency: 77%<br>Science Proficiency: 0%<br>AYP was not met<br>Grade: DECLINING Rating (2008-2009)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 32%<br>Math Learning Gains: 59%<br>Writing Proficiency 62%<br>Science Proficiency 0 %<br>AYP was not met<br>Grade: IMPROVING Rating (2007-2008)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 55%<br>Math Learning Gains: 74%<br>Writing Proficiency 93%<br>Science Proficiency 14%<br>AYP was not met |

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Coach | June King | Emotional Disturbed, and Varying Exceptional, Master Degree in Reading, Reading Endorsement K-12 | 15 | 9 | Grade: Not Rated (2011-2012)<br>Reading Learning Gains: No Data to report<br>AYP was not met<br>Grade: Not Rated (2010-2011)<br>Reading Learning Gains:50%<br>AYP was not met<br>Grade: Not Rated (2009-2010)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 42%<br>AYP was met<br>Grade: DECLINING Rating (2008-2009)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 32%<br>AYP was not met<br>Grade: IMPROVING Rating (2007-2008)<br>Reading Learning Gains: 55%<br>AYP was not met |

## 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 | • On–Site Mentoring Program for teacher leaders and aspiring administrators. | Principal Assistant Principal | June 2013 | |
| 2 | • On-going Professional Development | Coaches and Lead Teachers | June 2013 | |
| 3 | • Weekly Team Meetings to provide faculty with support | Coaches and Team Leaders | June 2013 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| Mr. Dale Freehill is teaching Reading and is not currently Reading Endorsed. | Reading Coach, June King will provide ongoing meetings and support while he work on his Reading Endorsement. |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | 0.0%(0) | 20.0%(4) | 50.0%(10) | 30.0%(6) | 10.0%(2) | 100.0%(20) | 35.0%(7) | 0.0%(0) | 60.0%(12) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| June King | Dale Freehill | Mr. Freehill does not have a Reading Endorsement. Ms. King is the Reading Coach who has demonstrated excellent performance in improving students' FCAT Reading scores. | The reading coach facilitates the Literacy (Language Arts/Reading) Professional Learning Communities. Mr. Freehill will continue to participate in PLCs and partake in frequent chats with Ms. King. The reading coach will provide curriculum and instructional support by modeling lessons and conducting data analysis. |

# 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

These federal funds are being utilized to purchase instructional materials and supplies across all curriculum areas. They are also being utilized for various programs, which focus on our At-Risk Students.

Title II

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Family Counselor, Psychologist, General Education Teacher(s), ESE Support Facilitator, Social Worker, Behavior Specialist, and Substance Abuse Counselor.

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/RTI team uses a systematic method for evaluating the needs of all students and for fostering positive student outcomes through carefully selected and implemented interventions. The MTSS team focus is to identify students who may require more intensive instructional services and/or who may be eligible for an exceptional student education program and who are not progressing adequately in the core curriculum academically and/or behaviorally. The school-based MTSS/RTI Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss curriculum management, student achievement, and staff development needs. The team disaggregates data and develops strategies to address instructional and behavioral needs. The team collaborates with coaches, ESE Support Facilitators, and other resource teachers to model scientifically based lessons. The team meets with the school leadership team utilizes classroom walkthroughs and progress monitoring tools to identify model classrooms for other teachers to observe.s

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/RTI Team collaborates with SAC and the Leadership Team to provide input for the School Improvement Plan. The MTSS team monitors the progress, the implementation, and delivery of researched based instructional strategies. The team uses progress monitoring tools, school-wide data, and observational data to monitor student strengths and weaknesses. The data is routinely reviewed and used to make decisions about interventions needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. The team collaborates with the teachers and uses "data chats" as a means of routinely reviewing aggregated data to assess effectiveness of the core curriculum and behavior management strategies being used in the classroom. Based on the data chats and observed behaviors, teachers will document baseline data, develop intervention plans, monitor the effectiveness of interventions/progress, and determine successfulness of RtI problem-solving process.

### 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.

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.

Members of the team provided input, data, and insight into the RtI process as to the support system they will implement. A Filemaker Pro database was developed to monitor student progress. Classroom teachers monitor student progress and identify areas of concern. Teachers notify the RtI Leadership team for further observation. Individual student data is collected, and then data meetings are held to create plans with effective instructional strategies to implement. Tier I students are placed in regular education courses according to both academic performance and behavior. Tier II students are provided interventions and monitoring by the MTSS/RtI Team. Tier III students are provided individualized instruction, tutoring, and other support services provided by the MTSS/RtI Team.

Data sources are the following:
• Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for Reading, Math, and EOCs)
• Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
• Mini-Assessments in Reading, Math and Science
• Florida Oral Reading Fluency (FORF),
• Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
• FCAT 2.0 Reading, Math, Science, and Writing
• End-of Courses (EOCs).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A biweekly training will be conducted for all staff on the MTSS/RtI process. Staff will be trained on such functions as progress monitoring, interventions, and accommodations.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The members of the MTSS team will share in on-going collaborations where a monitoring plan will be employed and reviewed. Professional and Human Resource Development and trainings will be scheduled and enforced throughout the year based on school and student needs. MTSS meetings will be documented and data will be reviewed to ascertain the effectiveness of proposed strategies and plans.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Pine Ridge Education Center Literacy Leadership Team consist of Belinda Hope, Principal; Jon Feldman, Assistant Principal; June King, Reading Coach; Laura Kolo, Instructional Coach; Shayla McCloud, ESOL Coordinator; Adrienne Dixson, ESE Specialist. These members will facilitate and support school-wide reading initiatives and monitor the professional development needs of staff.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) meets weekly and evaluates school-wide data, disseminates information, and adjusts plans when necessary. Each member monitors the data in their respective areas. The LLT members facilitate together to develop the curriculum-based integration between reading and individual content areas. The Literacy Leadership Team members review the academic goals of the school improvement plan then report to their respective departments to refine and adjust IFCs as recommended by the analysis of data by the Leadership Team. The LLT uses the data to directly address the learning and intervention needs of the students. The LLT provides professional development that will lead to student achievement and conducts professional learning communities weekly in their respective areas. Weekly meetings are held to review and discuss students' assessment data, compare best teaching strategies, and revise instructional focus calendars. The LLT members monitor the implementation of the instructional calendars and provide assistance to teachers in developing focus lessons.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will implement a Literacy Across the Curriculum Plan enriched with research-based interventions, best practices, diagnostics, ongoing assessments and family literacy activities. The LLT will generate resources available to all content areas to support effective literacy instructions and encourage the implementation of the Common Core shifts. In addition to, the LLT will maintain the fidelity of our reading programs, intervention groups, and continue the development of differentiated instruction within all core classes. The efforts of LLT will be a continuous process throughout the year in order to raise student achievement and proficiency across the curriculum.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will be implementing a Literacy Across the Curriculum Plan that involves all content and non-content area teachers. All teachers will embed the Reading Curriculum Framework Calendar into their curriculum and cover the designated benchmarks through their content areas. Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) where they will be given the opportunity to collaborate with teachers of different content areas to ensure that appropriate reading strategies are successfully implemented in all content areas. As well, the LLT will integrate research-based strategies and monitor the implementation of strategies across all curriculum areas. The following professional development topics will be provided through our PLCs, Early Release Days, & Professional Development Days:
• Implementing Common Core State Standards
• Understanding Student Data
• Higher Order Questioning
• School wide Curriculum Framework Calendar
• Writing in the Content Area
• Differentiated Instruction
• Infusing Technology

Utilizing student data and collaborations from teachers, interventions will be developed and implemented by reading teachers based on students' individual needs. In an effort to promote school-wide implementation of literacy, all teachers will incorporate classroom libraries that can include content area text and/or books relating to instructional themes. As well, students will be encouraged to participate in several reading activities throughout the school year that will include novel studies, PBL (Project Based Learning), WebQuests, cross-curricular theme projects, and school wide programs promoting critical thinking and reading skills.

## *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?

• Student courses offer real world applications in connection to their future course of study.
• Teachers utilize an integrated curriculum, FACTS.org, and ePEP to assist our students in developing career and education research and course planning.
• College representatives and Technical Centers visit the school and exposes students to pertinent information as it relates to higher education.
• All secondary students participate in an instructional integrated plan, "Future Planning and Career Exploration Unit" to ensure all students are connecting subject area instruction relevant to future experiences.
• Students have the opportunity of completing community involvement activities through their elective courses and Human Relation Council.
• The Guidance Counselor informs the students of their academic course selections together with future career planning options that allows students to choose their future course of study.

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?

• Guidance Counselor follows Policy 6000.1 for promotion and acceleration mechanisms.

• The Annual Guidance Plan goals are aligned with the district's social, personal, academic initiatives.
• Guidance Counselor meets with students to discuss academic and personal goals.
• High school students are encouraged to take coursework via Education2020 to accelerate as well as to gain credit/course recovery.
• Middle school students are offered the Career Education elective course and Career Planning is embedded in the 7th Grade Civics class.
• High school students are enrolled in the Personal and Career Development elective.

## 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

• Guidance Counselor meets daily/weekly with students to discuss course selection, academic progress, and post secondary options, as related to interests and graduation requirements.
• Eligible students are provided ACT and SAT waivers.
• All 10th grade students will be administered the PSAT.
• Students conference with counselor and teachers regarding postsecondary options.
• Guidance Counselor provides frequent credit checks with high school students to keep them on target for graduation.
• Students attend the Junior Experience College Fair, tours of various colleges/universities, and Construction Career Day fair, to gain exposure to different career options.
• College and Technical school representatives visit junior and senior classes.

# 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | By June 2013, all students will receive ongoing effective classroom instruction ensuring that that all Common Core and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards by The State of Florida and The Broward County School Board are effectively implemented within the classroom setting. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 10.4% (7) of students in grades 3 through 10 met high standards in reading by scoring Level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0. | 14% (9) of students in grades 3 through 10 will meet high standards in reading by scoring Level 3 and/or above in the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0. |

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 | Students have deficiencies in fluency. | Level 1 and 2 students will participate in Jamestown Fluency drills 3 times per week. | Reading Coach | Analyze data using Jamestown Fluency Progress Monitoring Chart. | Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) |
| 2 | Reading strategies and instruction are not consistently applied school-wide. | Develop a comprehensive Reading Plan to be implemented across the curriculum. Include target areas of instruction within the benchmark as a provided instructional focus calendar to meet the needs of the school's transient population. Provide staff development and resource support. | Reading Coach, Curriculum Specialist and Instructional Coach | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. CRISS strategies and Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. Bi-monthly Benchmark assessments.<br><br>Teachers will be monitored and observed on a daily basis for implementation of reading strategies. | Observation of classroom instructional practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |
| 3 | Students lack participation in on-going assessments | Use resources to develop focused instruction for students. Re-teach/remediate benchmarks as needed. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Review FAIR, BAT and Mini- Benchmarks Assessments to ensure that teachers are adjusting instruction according to the created schedule. | Print, review and analyze FAIR, BAT and Mini-BAT Assessments |
| 4 | Students have deficiencies in fluency. | Level 1 and 2 students will participate in Jamestown Fluency drills 3 times per week. | Reading Coach, Classroom teachers | Analyze data using Jamestown Fluency Progress Monitoring Chart. | Timed Bi-weekly District Mini-Benchmark Assessments |
| 5 | Students demonstrate an inability to apply basic reading skills in the content areas. | During Literacy PLCs teachers will collaborate on how to incorporate reading skills and strategies into their content area. | Reading Coach Classroom Teachers | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. Marzano's Nine High Yield Strategies will be utilized to determine the quality of lessons. Bi-weekly Benchmark Assessments will be used | Observation of classroom instructional practices<br><br>District Mini-Benchmark Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | to guide corrective feedback to students. | |
| 6 | Students lack of attendance during on-going assessments | Reteach focus areas throughout the school year<br><br>Remediate and retest benchmarks as needed | Reading Coach Classroom Teacher | Collaborate with Social Worker to increase student attendance. Frequent parent contact. | Daily Attendance Monitoring Plan |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | By June 2013,7% (5) students in grades 3 through 10 will exceed proficiency in reading in the administration of the FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 3% (2) of students in grades 3 through 10 demonstrated proficiency in reading in the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0. | 6% (3) students in grades 3-10 will exceed proficiency in reading in the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0. |

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 | Students are in attendance less than 78% of the school year. | Establish enhanced communication with parents<br>Refer students to RTI<br>Set -up goals and incentives for students | RTI team | Administrators and Reading Coach will review the bi-monthly mini-assessments<br>Principal, Asst-Principal and Reading Coach will have weekly data chats with teachers. | FCAT, FAIR and Mini Benchmark Assessments. |
| | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be wedded to reference and research benchmarks. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project base learning assignments monthly. | Project Base Learning Rubric |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | | | | Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br><br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are provided differentiated instruction during project-base learning.<br><br>Coaches will discussed effectiveness of during professional learning communities | |
| 3 | Students lack challenging and varied curriculum | Enriched units of study will include reading comprehension and stamina building strategies to be implemented in the content areas and applied to academic plans such as context clues, QAR techniques, graphic organizers and text frames.<br><br>Teachers will expose student to high interest reading materials that include context based reading selections. | Principal, Coaches | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are participating in every reading class in demonstrations and interest centers.<br><br>Reading Coach will monitor teachers' lesson plans, job embedded follow up activities and use of classroom libraries. | Classroom Walkthroughs |
| 4 | Implementing higher order questioning within daily instruction | Project-based instruction with high-interest tasks<br><br>Teachers utilize FCAT Item Specs within daily instruction<br><br>Higher-frequency inclusion of informational text –based sources | Reading Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Rubrics from evaluations<br>Bi-Weekly Benchmark Assessments | Project Presentations<br><br>Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 |
| 5 | Teachers lack implementation of challenging and rigorous curriculum | Challenge students with Project-based learning/ WebQuest<br><br>Utilize varies complexity of text within instruction<br><br>Blooms Taxonomy question stems | Reading Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Project Presentations<br>Bi-weekly Mini Assessments | Project Presentations<br>BAT Data<br>FAIR Data<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Data |
| 6 | Students who are at Level 4 may be at risk of dropping to Level 3 | Implement individualized tutoring: PUSH-IN, PULL-OUT plan | Reading Coach | Data Chats | Bi-weekly Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br><br>FAIR Data Reports<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students lack reading endurance and have short attention spans. | Students will receive 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction for appropriate grade and functional levels as outlined in the District's K-12 Reading Plan and the struggling Readers' Matrix.<br><br>Progress monitoring will guide academic interventions in reading. All non-proficient students will participate in push-in, pull-out academic tutoring and enrichment activities . | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach | Monitor the implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan and include the Master Schedule within the 90 minute reading block.<br><br>Develop and monitor a school calendar to ensure that tutorials and enrichments are taking place based on students bi-monthly assessment data | Observation of classroom instructional practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |
| 2 | Reading strategies and instruction are not consistently applied school-wide. | Develop a comprehensive Reading Plan to be implemented across the curriculum. Include target areas of instruction within the benchmarks, an instructional focus calendar to meet the needs of the school's transient population. Provide staff development and resource support. Every department will support | Curriculum Specialist and Instructional Coach | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. CRISS strategies and Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. Bi-monthly assessments.<br><br>Teachers will be monitored and observed on a daily basis for | Observation of classroom instructional practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | the instructional focus bench marks that will be covered by using content-based reading selections. | | implementation of the District K-12 Comprehension Reading Plan. | |
| 3 | District Instructional calendar may not meet the needs of the of the transient population of students served. | Develop a school based Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading and language Arts. Bi-monthly assessments will be administered at the completion of a benchmark or cluster of benchmarks. Reading Coach will provide follow-up staff development for remediation or enrichment. | Reading Coach | Administration will be aware of the upcoming IFC's focus and monitor implementation. Administration will review results of mini-assessments with teachers and a student through on-going data chats. | Effectiveness will be determined by using FCAT, FAIR, DAR Word Lists, Oral Reading Fluency and DAR data assessments. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal # 5A : Pine Ridge Education Center will reduce the achievement gap annually by 3%, using best practices in delivering reading instruction aligned to common core curriculum. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | Students in each ethnicity subgroups not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 3% on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The FCAT 2.0 2012 results:<br>White: N/A<br>Black: 96% (56)<br>Hispanic: 10% (4)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: 100% (1) | By June 2013, each ethnicity subgroups not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 3% on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test. |

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 | Reading strategies and instruction are not consistently applied school-wide | Develop a comprehensive Reading Plan to be implemented across the curriculum. Include target areas of instruction within the benchmarks, an instructional focus calendar to meet the needs of the school's transient population. Provide staff development and resource support. Every department will support the instructional focus benchmarks that will be covered by using content-based reading selections. | Reading Coach, Curriculum Specialist and Instructional Coach | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. CRISS strategies and Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. Bi-monthly benchmark assessments.<br><br>Teachers will be monitored and observed on a daily basis for implementation of the District K-12 Comprehension Reading Plan components in lesson plans and practice. | Observation of classroom teaching practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |
| 2 | Students learn differently and their instruction needs to be tailored accordingly. | All teachers will use differentiated instruction using evidence–based instructional practices. | Coaches and Support Facilitator | Students will be assessed using the FAIR for ongoing progress monitoring and the mini benchmark assessments bi-monthly. | Mini benchmark assessments will be used to determine students' progress through the Instructional Focus Calendar. |
| | Students lack the motivation | Plan and develop targeted intervention | RTI Team/Case Manager | Mini benchmark assessments | FAIR OPM and DAR data when |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | | tailored to address individual needs of students who are not successful with the core curriculum. | | will determine the type and frequency of Reading interventions | appropriate will be used to determine students' progress through the Instructional Focus Calendar. |
| 4 | 5B.1.<br>Students lack vocabulary and the ability to use context clues, base words, affixes, antonyms, synonyms, homographs, and homophones to determine the meanings of words. | 5B.1.<br>Vocabulary strategies will be implemented in all core areas.<br><br>Students will receive additional instructional support through Pullouts to address the needs previously identified.<br><br>Data analysis will be used to monitor students' progress and conduct data chats between Mini-Assessments and Mock FCAT assessments. | 5B.1.<br>Reading Coach<br>Instructional Coaches<br>Core Area Teachers | 5B.1.<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Mock FCAT Assessments | 5B.1.<br>FAIR and District<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Data |
| 5 | 5B.2.<br>Students experience lower than average reading success due to lack of reading materials and use of technology resources outside of school. | 5B.2.<br>Students not responding to core curriculum will receive supplemental instruction and interventions.<br><br>Technology (ActivExpressions, LCD projectors, and Mimeo) embedded into daily instruction. | 5B.2.<br>Reading Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | 5B.2.<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Mock FCAT 2.0 Assessments | 5B.2.<br>Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Data |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | In grades 3 through 10, Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| 100% (19) of students in grades 3 through 10, did not demonstrate proficiency in reading in the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0. | In grades 3 through 10, 3% (1) Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students with disabilities require more exposure of effective reading strategies | Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction to meet student's individual needs.<br><br>Teachers will implement CRISS (graphic organizers, two-column notes, and brainstorm carousel) strategies in their daily instruction. | Reading Coach<br>ESE Specialist<br>ESE Facilitator<br>Classroom Teacher | FAIR<br>On going Progress Monitoring<br>(OPM)<br>Data chats | FAIR Assessments<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 2 | Lack of teacher understanding of differentiation in the classroom | Literacy PLCs will focus on data use in the classroom, grouping, and differentiate instruction, delivery, resources, and strategies | Reading Coach<br>ESE Specialist<br>ESE Facilitator<br>Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans<br>Staff development (PLCs/SLC)<br>Classroom Observations | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Effective Lesson Plans<br>Professional Development Agenda(s) |
| 3 | Lack of teacher understanding of differentiation in the classroom | Literacy PLCs will focus on data use in the classroom, grouping, and differentiate instruction, delivery, resources, and strategies | Reading Coach<br>ESE Specialist<br>ESE Facilitator<br>Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans<br>Staff development (PLCs/SLC)<br>Classroom Observations | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Effective Lesson Plans<br>Professional Development Agenda(s) |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | By June 2013, 85% of students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage will make satisfactory progress in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3 through 10, 88% (55) students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage did not make satisfactory progress in reading. | By June 2013, 85% (54) students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage will make satisfactory progress in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of reading support in the home. | Use of the Media Center to enhance reading opportunities. | Reading Coach | FAIR<br>(OPM) three times annually<br>Bi-weekly Mini-Assessments | FAIR<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 2 | Students experience lower than average reading success due to lack of reading and technology usage. | Students not responding to core curriculum will receive supplemental instruction and interventions. | Reading Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | FAIR<br>(OPM) three times annually<br>Bi-weekly Mini-Assessments | FAIR<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implementing a school-wide Literacy Across the Board in all Content Areas | All Grades/All Subjects | Literacy Leadership Team | All Instructional Staff of grades K-12 | Weekly 8:30 am - 9:30 am | Classroom Walk-through, FAIR (OPM), Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Administration and Literacy Leadership Team |
| Differentiated Instruction | All Grades/All Subjects | Literacy Leadership Team | All Instructional Staff of grades K-12 | Ongoing training within Literacy PLCs | Classroom Walk-through, lesson plans, and Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Administration and Literacy Leadership Team |
| Common Core Implementation | All Grades/All Subjects | Literacy Leadership Team | All Instructional Staff of grades K-12 | Ongoing training within Literacy PLCs | Data from bi-weekly reading assessments | Administration and Literacy Leadership Team |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Common Core Implementation | Common Core Readiness | District funded | $0.00 |
| Increase teachers' knowledge of College Board: Spring Board | Common Core Readiness | District funded | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Integrating Technology into daily instruction | On-going Promethean Board, LCD projectors, and ActivExpression Training | Title 1, Part D | $19,638.40 |
| Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $5,989.00 |
| Content Analysis: Analyzing Student Data for Student Success | On-going FileMaker Pro Training | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $25,627.40 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| The Art and Science of Teaching – Robert Marzano Best Practices for Increasing Student Achievement and Improving Instruction Deliberate Practice-Common Core | Copies of the book for all teachers | Purchased through school budget | $0.00 |
| PLCs specifically targeting the focus lesson; how to effectively differentiate instruction; how to develop higher order questions and activities; how to effectively implement the Common Core; how to develop/implement rigorous lessons. | Common Core Readiness | District provided trainings | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provide a "pull out" tutorial for six weeks prior to FCAT testing for students in small groups of 3-5 students. | Provide tutoring for six weeks before FCAT testing during the third semester. | Title 1, Part D | $28,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $28,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $53,627.40 |

*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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | |

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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | |

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. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not |

| | |
|---|---|
| CELLA Goal #3: | applicable to our school. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

## 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | Staff development will be provided to align with best practices in math, benchmarks, the Next Generation State Standards, Common Core State Standards, and FCAT 2.0 assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| During the 2012 FCAT 2.0 administration, there were no students to achieve Level 3 in mathematics | By June 2013, 3% (1) student will score a level 3 and/or above on the FCAT 2.0 Math test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students have deficiencies in fluency. | Level 1 and 2 students will participate in Jamestown Fluency drills 3 times per week. | Reading Coach | Analyze data using Jamestown Fluency Progress Monitoring Chart. | Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) |
| 2 | Reading strategies and instruction are not consistently applied school-wide. | Develop a comprehensive Reading Plan to be implemented across the curriculum. Include target areas of instruction within the benchmark as a provided instructional focus calendar to meet the needs of the school's transient population. Provide staff development and resource support. | Reading Coach, Curriculum Specialist and Instructional Coach | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. CRISS strategies and Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. Bi-monthly Benchmark assessments.<br><br>Teachers will be monitored and observed on a daily basis for implementation of reading strategies. | Observation of classroom instructional practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |
| 3 | Students lack participation in on-going assessments | Use resources to develop focused instruction for students. Re-teach/remediate benchmarks as needed. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Review FAIR, BAT and Mini- Benchmarks Assessments to ensure that teachers are adjusting instruction according to the created schedule. | Print, review and analyze FAIR, BAT and Mini-BAT Assessments |
| 4 | Correctly implementation of the GO Math series.<br><br>Monitoring in-school reinforcement of math skills for all students using GO Math | Teachers will attend training that will assist them with utilization of the new math series. | Classroom Teacher Instructional Coaches | Instructional Coaches will conduct trainings during Math Meetings and continue to monitor effective use. | Observations BAT Assessments, Classroom Walk-Through 2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 5 | Students' varied levels of math proficiency coupled with reading difficulties make it difficult for students to read and understand solving word problems in math. | Provide Staff Development for best practices in math strategies, aligned with NGSSS and CCSS.<br><br>Continue using Voyager Learning and Riverdeep Math programs to support GO math program. | Classroom Teacher Instructional Coaches | Review bi-weekly assessment data reports to adjust instruction as needed to ensure progress is being made and students are making learning gains. | Observations BAT Assessments, Classroom Walk-Through 2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Provide reinforcement in basic math computation skills for all students. | | | |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of students achieving at or above Level 4 and 5 in the Math administration of FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| During the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0, 2% (1) of students scored at/or above Level 4. | By June 2013, 5% (2) students will score at or above level 4 or 5 in mathematics. |

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 | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be wedded to reference and research benchmarks. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project base learning assignments monthly.<br><br>Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br><br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are provided differentiated instruction during project-base learning. | Project Base Learning Rubric |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Coaches will discussed effectiveness of during professional learning communities | |
| 2 | Students lack challenging and varied curriculum | Enriched units of study will include reading comprehension and stamina building strategies to be implemented in the content areas and applied to academic plans such as context clues, QAR techniques, graphic organizers and text frames.<br><br>Teachers will expose student to high interest reading materials that include context based reading selections. | Principal, Coaches | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are participating in every reading class in demonstrations and interest centers.<br><br>Reading Coach will monitor teachers' lesson plans, job embedded follow up activities and use of classroom libraries. | Classroom Walkthroughs |
| 3 | Teachers lack the proper professional development and support needed to assist high achieving students. | Teachers will attend district instructed workshops.<br><br>Math Coach and Math teachers collaborate in developing rigorous and relevant lessons. | Math Teachers Instructional Coaches | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Diagnostic assessments<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 4 | Motivating students to achieve at a higher level. | Utilize technology (Promethean flip charts and Brianpop) to attract students interest and enhanced math instruction.<br><br>Incorporate an incentive program | Math Teachers Instructional Coaches | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Diagnostic assessments<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning | |

| | |
|---|---|
| gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Elementary School Mathematics Goal #<br>5A : Pine Ridge Education Center will reduce the achievement gap annually by 6%, using best practices in delivering mathematics instruction aligned to common core curriculum. | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | Students in each ethnicity subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 3% on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 100% (1)<br>Black: 90% (50)<br>Hispanic: 85% (6)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A | White: 0% (0)<br>Black: 87% (49)<br>Hispanic: 82% (5)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: 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 | Motivating students to achieve at a higher level | Utilize technology (Promethean flip charts and Manipulatives) to attract students interest and enhanced math instruction.<br><br>Incorporate an incentive program | Math Teachers<br>Instructional Coaches | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT 2.0 Assessments<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not | Due to our unique student population, this section is not |

| | |
|---|---|
| applicable to our school. | applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | In grades 3 through 10, 3% (1) Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n grades 3 through 10, 100% (18) Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 | In grades 3 through 10, 3% (1) Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 |

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 | Students with disabilities require more exposure of effective mathematics strategies. | Teachers will utilize differentiated instruction to meet student's individual needs.<br><br>Teachers will implement CRISS such as graphic organizers for multi-step problems and manipulatives in their daily instruction. | Instructional Coach<br>ESE Specialist<br>ESE Facilitator<br>Classroom Teacher | Data chats<br><br>Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments |
| 2 | Motivating students to achieve at a higher level | Utilize technology (Promethean flip charts and Manipulatives) to attract students interest and enhanced math instruction.<br><br>Incorporate an incentive program | Math Teachers<br>Instructional Coaches | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT 2.0 Assessments<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | By June 2013, students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3 through 10, 90% (52) students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics | By June 2013, 87% (51) students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students experience lower than average mathematics success due to lack of practice. | Students will be given homework on a weekly basic to review and practice concepts being taught. | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach | Data chats<br><br>Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Classroom walk-throughs<br><br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br><br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of students achieving at or above Level 3 in the Mathematics administration of FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6 through 8, 15% (7) students achieved a Level 3 in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. | By June 2013, there will be a 18% (8) increase in students scoring Level 3 in Mathematics. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack basic computation skills. | Teachers provide supplemental academic interventions with Push-in and Pullout tutoring.<br><br>FCAT Item Specs used as Do Now/warm up activities.<br><br>Provide frequent basic skills quizzes. | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coaches | Teachers provide frequent assessments of basic computation skills<br><br>Instructional Coaches and Math teacher will review results of common assessment data bi-monthly to determine progress.<br><br>Instructional Coaches and<br>Assistant Principal will conduct Data chats bi-weekly with teachers and monthly with students. | Common assessment of basic skills tied to NGSSS<br><br>Mini benchmark assessment administered biweekly<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 results |
| 2 | Students lack participation in ongoing assessments. | Use resources to develop focused instruction for students.<br><br>Reteach/remediate benchmarks as needed. | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coaches | Review ongoing assessments data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students and adjusting instruction according to the developed schedule. | Mini benchmark assessment administered biweekly<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 results |
| | Lack of problem solving skills to solve word | Teachers provide supplemental academic | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional | Instructional Coaches and Math teacher will | Common assessment of |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | problems. | interventions with Push-in and Pullout tutoring. | Coaches | review results of common assessment data bi-monthly to determine progress.<br>Data chats will be conducted biweekly with teachers and students. | solving word problems tied to NGSSS<br><br>Mini benchmark assessment administered biweekly<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 results |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | Students will develop higher-level thinking skills and problem-solving skills to enhance mathematical proficiency at deep conceptual levels of understanding. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6 through 8, 2% (1) of students achieved at or above Level 4 and 5 in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. | By June 2013, there will be a 5% (2) of students achieving at or above Level 4 and 5 in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teacher lack knowledge of integrating technology into daily instruction | Biweekly PLCs focusing on implementation of various technology usage (Promethean Boards, Mimeo, LCD projector, and FCAT explorer) | Classroom Teacher<br>Technology Support Facilitator | PLCs Evaluation Notes<br>Lesson Plans<br>Classroom walkthroughs | Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Classroom observations<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| | Limited proficiency in strategies that promote deep, critical thinking for | Teachers implement higher order questioning and FCAT Item Specs | Instructional Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Lesson Plans | Mini Benchmark Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | all students. | into their daily instruction. | | | Classroom observations<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our schools. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our schools. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our schools. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | By June 2013, there will be an increase in students making learning gains in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 6 through 8, 43% (3) of students made learning gains in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. | By June 2013, 48% (4) of students will make learning gains in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students lack motivation to learn new Math concepts. | Teachers will incorporate technology, manipulatives, and project based learning into their lessons | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach | Lesson Plans<br>Classroom walkthroughs<br>Rubrics from project based learning | Mini Benchmark Assessment Data<br>Students' project based learning products<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 2 | Many students are below grade level in their ability to apply reading comprehension strategies to understand word problems. | Math teachers will collaborate with their Instructional Coach and the Reading Coaches to teach, model and guide students in effectively applying reading strategies in content area. | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach<br>Reading Coach | Lesson Plans<br>Classroom walkthroughs<br>Real-world word problem assessments | Mini Benchmark Assessments Data<br>Teacher Observation<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

| 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:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Middle School Mathematics Goal #

5A : Pine Ridge Education Center will reduce the achievement gap annually by 6%, using best practices in delivering mathematics instruction aligned to common core curriculum.

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | Students in each ethnicity subgroup not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 100% (1)<br>Black: 91% (50)<br>Hispanic: 86% (6)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A | White: 0% (0)<br>Black: 88% (49)<br>Hispanic: 83% (5)<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: 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 | Motivating students to achieve at a higher level | Utilize technology (Promethean flip charts and Manipulatives) to attract students interest and enhanced math instruction.<br><br>Incorporate an incentive program | Math Teachers<br>Instructional Coaches | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Mock FCAT 2.0 Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Data from Mock FCAT 2.0 Assessments<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | By June 2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 3 through 10, will make 3% increase in learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| In grades 3 through 10, 100% (18) Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test. | In grades 3 through 10, 97% (17) Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of differentiating instruction based on students' areas of weakness | Teachers will differentiate classroom instruction and deliver small group instruction based on flexible grouping and needs<br><br>Use Marzano strategy of Organizing Students to Interact with New Knowledge<br><br>Integration of Computer-Aided Instruction for remediation | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach | Review student groupings to ensure they vary based on skill;<br><br>Student performance on Mini-Assessments | Mini Benchmark Assessments Data<br>Teacher Observation<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results. |

| 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education center will increase the number of students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage not making satisfactory progress in FCAT 2.0 mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3 through 10, 90% (52) students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | By June 2013, 5% (51) of students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantage will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students experience lower than average mathematics success due to lack of practice. | Students will be given homework on a weekly basic to review and practice concepts being taught. | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach | Data chats<br>Classroom walk-throughs<br>Submission of Lesson Plans<br>Mini-Benchmark Assessments | Mini Benchmark Assessments Data<br>Teacher Observation<br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | By June 2013, there will be an increase in the number of students scoring at or above a level 3 in the Algebra 1 EOC. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| During the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC, 6% (1) of students scored at or above level 3 in Algebra. | By June 2013, students scoring at or above a level 3 in the Algebra 1 EOC will increase by 9% (2). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students enter high school below grade level and unprepared for the rigors of algebraic computations. | Differentiated instruction to include the use of technology and hands-on activities that reveal the relevance of concepts to real-world | Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coach | Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Classroom Discussions amongst students and teachers; Classroom Teacher and Instructional Coach will be able to determine the effectiveness of the differentiated instruction, teaching strategies, and technological resources. | Lesson plans<br>Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |

| 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.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | Due to our unique population of students, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique population of students, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique population of students, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Algebra Goal # 3A : Pine Ridge Education Center will reduce the achievement gap annually by 6%, using best practices in delivering mathematics instruction aligned to common core curriculum. | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3B: | All of the identified student subgroups will demonstrate a decrease in the amount of students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The following student subgroups are currently not making satisfactory progress in Algebra<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Mixed: Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A<br><br>We have no baseline data to calculate. | The following student subgroups, as assessed by the Algebra EOC, will demonstrate an increase in the number of students making satisfactory progress Algebra<br>White:<br>Black: Hispanic:<br>Mixed: |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of student motivation | Differentiated instruction to include the use of technology and hands-on activities that reveal the relevance of concepts to real-life<br><br>Provide professional development for teachers by teachers on strategies to use and/or resources<br><br>Offer students incentives for meeting academic expectations ("Bulldog Bucks" for students achieving mastery on bi-weekly assessments) | Classroom Teacher<br><br>Instructional Coach | Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Classroom Discussions amongst students and teachers; Classroom Teacher and Instructional Coach will be able to determine the effectiveness of the differentiated instruction, teaching strategies, and technological resources. | Lesson plans<br>Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |
| 2 | Lack of pre-requisite skills (readiness) for Algebra | Utilize re-teaching strategies at the beginning of the school year and the beginning of a unit as necessary | Classroom Teacher<br><br>Instructional Coach | Mini Benchmark Assessments | Lesson plans<br>Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |

| 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. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not |

| | |
|---|---|
| Algebra Goal #3C: | applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | The percentage of students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged will make an increase in satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| There is no baseline data to calculate. | By June 2013, the percentage of students within the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged will make a 7% increase in satisfactory progress. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lack of student | Differentiated instruction | ESE Specialists | Mini Benchmark | Lesson plans |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | motivation. | to include the use of technology and hands-on activities that reveal the relevance of concepts to real-life<br><br>Provide professional development for teachers by teachers on strategies to use and/or resources<br><br>Offer students incentives for meeting academic expectations ("Bulldog Bucks" for students achieving mastery on bi-weekly assessments) | ESE Facilitator<br>Behavior Specialist<br>Instructional Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Assessments<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Monitor weekly Positive Behavior Point System Data | Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |

*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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | During the 2013 administration of the Geometry EOC, there will be an increase in the number of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In the 2012 administration of Geometry EOC, 100% (4) scored in the lowest tier. | By June 2013, 3% (1) of our students will score Level 3 on the Geometry EOC. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of student motivation (Students not being actively involved in learning in the Geometry classroom.) | Differentiated instruction to include the use of technology and hands-on activities that reveal the relevance of concepts to real-life<br><br>Provide professional development for teachers by teachers on strategies to use and/or resources<br><br>Offer students incentives for meeting academic expectations ("Bulldog Bucks" for students achieving mastery on bi-weekly assessments) | Behavior Specialist<br>Instructional Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Monitor weekly Positive Behavior Point System Data | Lesson plans<br>Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |
| 2 | Providing extensive support to the FCAT Level 1 and 2 | Increase student awareness of data and complete goal setting sessions after each benchmark assessment | Instructional Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Conduct data chats and goal setting amongst teachers and students<br><br>Monitoring of students | Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>2013 FCAT Results |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Level 1 and 2 students participate in Push-in, Pullout tutoring twice a week. | | on mini-assessment work<br><br>Monitoring of students success in tutoring | |

| 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | Due to our unique population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Geometry Goal #<br>3A : Pine Ridge Education Center will reduce the achievement gap annually by 6%, using best practices in delivering mathematics instruction aligned to common core curriculum. | | | |
| 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3B: | Each of the student subgroups will demonstrate a decrease in the amount of students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The following student subgroups are currently not making satisfactory progress in Geometry EOC<br>White:<br>Black: Hispanic:<br>Mixed: Asian:<br>American Indian:<br><br>There is no baseline data to calculate. | The following student subgroups, White:<br>Black: Hispanic:<br>Mixed: Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A as assessed by the Geometry EOC, will demonstrate an increase 10% (2) in the number of students making satisfactory progress |

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 | Lack of student motivation | Differentiated instruction to include the use of technology and hands-on activities that reveal the relevance of concepts to real-life<br><br>Provide professional development for teachers by teachers on strategies to use and/or resources<br><br>Offer students incentives for meeting academic expectations ("Bulldog Bucks" for students achieving mastery on bi-weekly assessments | Behavior Specialist<br>Instructional Coach<br>Classroom Teacher | Mini Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Monitor weekly Positive Behavior Point System Data | Lesson plans<br>Data from Mini Benchmark Assessments<br>2013 FCAT Results |

| 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.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3C: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3D: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3E: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Infusing Technology | All K – 12 Mathematics classes | Instructional Coach/ Technology Support Facilitator | Math teachers of students in grades K -12 | Embedded in ongoing Math and Technology Professional Learning Communities | Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Data from Math assessments | Instructional Coach |
| Differentiated Instruction | All K – 12 Mathematics classes | Instructional Coach | Math teachers of students in grades K -12 | Embedded in ongoing Math Professional Learning Communities | Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Data from Math assessments | Instructional Coach |
| Implementation of Common Core | All K – 12 Mathematics classes | Instructional Coach | Math teachers of students in grades K -12 | Embedded in ongoing Math Professional Learning Communities | Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Data from Math assessments | Instructional Coach |

Mathematics Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Professional Development for Algebra I and Geometry teachers | District Trainings | District funded | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Integration of technology into classroom instruction | Trainings on Promethean Boards, ActivExpression, and LCD projectors. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Calculators for students in Algebra and Geometry classes to provide adequate practice and familiarity with technology | Scientific Calculators | Title 1, Part D | $635.88 |
| Renewed courses for E2020 class | Supplemental material for Algebra and Geometry EOCs | Title 1, Part D | $4,650.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $5,285.88 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Provide professional development specifically targeting the focus lesson; how to effectively differentiate instruction; how to develop higher order questions and activities; how to effectively implement the Common Core State Standards; how to develop/implement rigorous lessons. | District provided trainings and workshops | District funded | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Provide a "pull out" tutoring for four weeks prior to FCAT testing for students in small groups of 3-5 students. | Provide tutoring for four weeks before FCAT testing during second semester. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $5,285.88 |

*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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of the students meeting high standards in science by scoring level 3 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) of the students in grades 3 through 8 did not meet high standards in science with scoring level 3 and above on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0. | By June 2013, 3% (1) of the students in grades 3 through 8 will meet high standards in science by scoring level 3 the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0. |
| 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 | Students have deficiencies in fluency. | Level 1 and 2 students will participate in Jamestown Fluency drills 3 times per week. | Reading Coach | Analyze data using Jamestown Fluency Progress Monitoring Chart. | Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) |
| 2 | Reading strategies and instruction are not consistently applied school-wide. | Develop a comprehensive Reading Plan to be implemented across the curriculum. Include target areas of instruction within the benchmark as a provided instructional focus calendar to meet the needs of the school's transient population. Provide staff development and resource support. | Reading Coach, Curriculum Specialist and Instructional Coach | Data from the District Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) will be used to identify skill deficiencies. CRISS strategies and Marzano's nine high yield strategies will be utilized to assist students. Bi-monthly Benchmark assessments.<br><br>Teachers will be monitored and observed on a daily basis for implementation of reading strategies. | Observation of classroom instructional practices and District Mini-Benchmark Assessments. |
| 3 | Students lack participation in on-going assessments | Use resources to develop focused instruction for students.<br>Re-teach/remediate benchmarks as needed. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Review FAIR, BAT and Mini- Benchmarks Assessments to ensure that teachers are adjusting instruction according to the created schedule. | Print, review and analyze FAIR, BAT and Mini-BAT Assessments |
| 4 | Students have misconception regarding essential science concepts. | Utilize activating background knowledge strategies to identify student misconceptions.<br><br>Adapt hands-on instructional strategies to address student-learning needs.<br><br>Discuss instructional best practices in PLC's | Instructional Coach<br>Science Teachers | Instructional Coach observation data<br><br>Mini Benchmark Assessment will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.<br><br>Mock FCAT assessments<br><br>Examination of PLC notes | Analysis of Mini-Benchmarks Assessments Data<br><br>PLC notes<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 5 | Lack of reading content knowledge to embrace scientific knowledge. | Increase Reading in Content Area strategies (Science teachers participate and collaborate in Literacy PLC)<br><br>Utilize Discovery Education/United Streaming video clips, online resources (Fusion) , vocabulary development to increase students' scientific knowledge. | Science coach<br>Science teachers | Instructional Coach observation data<br><br>Mini Benchmark Assessment will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.<br><br>Mock FCAT assessments<br><br>Examination of PLC notes s | Analysis of Mini-Benchmarks Assessments Data<br><br>PLC notes<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| 6 | Students require additional exposure to real-world applications to understand scientific concepts | Teachers will expose students to real-world hands-on applications of science curriculum through the use of technology,<br>models, and real-life experiences from teacher resources and websites. | Science coach<br>Science teachers | Science coach observation data<br><br>Data from Science assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.<br><br>Mock FCAT assessments | Analysis of Benchmarks assessments data<br><br>PLC notes<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Examination of PLC 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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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 | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be added to reference and reserach benchmarks. | Principal, Assistant Principal and coaches | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project-based learning assignments monthly.<br>Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs. | Project-based learning rubric |
| 2 | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate. | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be added to reference and research benchmarks. | Principal, Assistant Principal and coaches. | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project-based learning assignments monthly.<br>Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs. | Project-based learning rubric. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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 | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be wedded to reference and research benchmarks. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project base learning assignments monthly.<br><br>Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br><br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are provided differentiated instruction during project-base learning.<br><br>Coaches will discussed effectiveness of during professional learning communities | Project Base Learning Rubric |
| 2 | Students lack challenging and varied curriculum | Enriched units of study will include reading comprehension and stamina building strategies to be implemented in the content areas and applied to academic plans such as context clues, QAR techniques, graphic organizers and text frames.<br><br>Teachers will expose student to high interest reading materials that include context based reading selections. | Principal, Coaches | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are participating in every reading class in demonstrations and interest centers.<br><br>Reading Coach will monitor teachers' lesson plans, job embedded follow up activities and use of classroom libraries. | Classroom Walkthroughs |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

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

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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.<br><br>Science Goal #2: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Without high interest or motivating tasks, students will not participate. | Project-based instruction with high interest tasks will be added to reference and research | Principal, Assistant Principal and coaches. | Administrators and Coaches will monitor students' participation in project-based learning assignments | Project-based learning rubric. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | benchmarks. | | monthly.<br>Coaches will discuss effectiveness of professional learning communities.<br>Principal, Assistant Principal and Coaches will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs. | |

## 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.<br><br>Biology Goal #1: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of students achieving Level 3 in Biology. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| During the 2012 administration of the Biology EOC, there were no students to meet the achievement Level 3 in Biology. | By June 2013, 3% (1) of the students will meet high standards in Biology by scoring level 3 on the 2013 administration of the Biology EOC.. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students Math skills | Teachers will intergrate math strategies into the science curriculum to increase content knowledge. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Instructional Coach | Science Instructional Coach, Administrative designee over Science will monitor Science through classroom walk-throughs to ensure teacher effectiveness. Administration will have have bi-monthly data chats with teachers and monthly data chats with students. | BAt 1 and BAT 2, Lab Sheets, Pre, Mid-year, Post Test and mini assessments willbe used to evaluate effective intergation of instructional strategies. |
| 2 | Students have different learning styles | Integrating the 5E Model for hands-on lab (project-based) activities and experiments on a weekly basis. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Science Instructional Coach | Create and monitor the effective use of lab schedule. | Monitor end of chapter assessments and lab activities.<br><br>BAT 1 and BAT 2 Lab Sheets, Pre, Mid-Year, Post Test and mini assessments will be used to evaluate effective integration of instructional strategies. |
| | Students have not mastered the basics of life science concept needed in order to | Incorporate Discovery Education/United Streaming videos and lessons into daily | Science Coach Science Teachers | Science coach observation data, examination of PLCs notes, and evaluation | Analysis of Benchmarks assessments data |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | begin with the biology standards. | instruction.<br><br>Utilize various reading and writing strategies (Power Writing, Two-column notes, use of probes and/or reading resource material) to increase students' understanding of life science concepts<br><br>Incorporate inquiry-based, hands-on, laboratory activities, which focus on the basics of life science and biology standards through the use of technology and online resources. | | of teacher's lesson plans<br><br>Data from Science assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.<br><br>Mock FCAT assessments | PLC notes<br><br>2013 FCAT data |
| 4 | Students need to develop higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency. | Incorporate inquiry-based laboratory activities of life science concepts.<br><br>Develop opportunities for students to engage in class discussion. Students can begin to independently analyze, explain, and transcribe about their acquired knowledge of life sciences concepts. | Science Coach<br>Science Teachers | Science coach observation data, examination of PLCs notes, and evaluation of teacher's lesson plans<br><br>Data from Science assessments will be reviewed to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus as needed.<br><br>Mock FCAT assessments | Analysis of Benchmarks assessments data<br><br>PLC notes<br><br>2013 FCAT 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 Biology.<br><br>Biology Goal #2: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Newly adopted science textbook Science Fusion | Middle school grades/ Science | District Facilitator | Middle School Science teachers | Offered during district scheduled workshops | Coaches will periodically observe teachers to review the effective use of newly adopted textbooks. | Administration and Science Coach |
| Integrating Technology and Hands-On Activities (ActivExpression, Mimeo, LCD projector, Inspiration webs, and WebQuest) | Elementary & Secondary Science | Science Coach and Technology Resource Facilitator | Elementary and Secondary Science teachers | Bi-weekly PLCs | Administrators/Science Coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Project-Based Learning implementation. | Administration and Science Coach |
| Implementing Differentiated Instruction | Elementary & Secondary | Science Instructional Coaches | All instructional staff | Bi-weekly PLCs | Administrators/Instructional Coaches conduct walk-throughs to monitor effectiveness of differentiated instruction. | Administration and Instructional Coaches |

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 |
| Students engage in real-world science experiences through the usage of technology. | Discovery Education/United Streaming virtual labs, ActivExpression, and LCD projectors. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of students achieving level 4 and/or above in writing on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing administration. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (2) of the students in grades 4, 8, and 10 scored level 4 and above in writing on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing administration. | 43% (3) of students in grades 4, 8, and 10 will score level 4 and above in writing on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing administration. inistration. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students may not have knowledge of effective characteristics of writing or how to include them in their writing | Trained teachers will use the 6+ Traits of Writing strategy to teach writing lessons and use the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).<br>to guide action steps.<br>PLAN: Bi-weekly Learning Communities, Lesson study<br>DO: Teach traits using the 6+ Traits of Writing<br>CHECK: The 6+ Writing Traits Rubric. Mini-Assessment<br>Disaggregate during bi-weekly data chats<br>ACT: Teach or re-teach. Use initial diagnostic and mini-assessment data to create the instructional focus calendar | Writing Coach | The Writing Coach will conduct bi-weekly data chats with Language Arts teachers and English teachers to monitor student progress.<br>Student/Teacher data chats monthly.<br>Teacher/Administration data chats quarterly. | The 6+ Writing Traits Rubric, FCAT Writing Rubric |
| 2 | Implementing writing mechanisms in each core curriculum class.<br><br>Promoting the 6 traits of writing in all core curriculum classes. | Train teachers on the 6 traits of writing strategy.<br><br>Develop a school wide writing plan to ensure authentic writing is being conducted in all content area classes including, Language Arts/English, Social Studies, Math, Reading, and Science.<br><br>Teachers will integrate the writing process within every subject area, through “Do Nows”/journal entries, writing prompts, short and extended responses. | Writing Coach<br>Instructional Coaches<br>Classroom Teachers | Monitoring bi-weekly collaboration between Writing teachers and other content area teachers.<br>Within PLCs and data chats with administration, writing coach, and teachers, chats will take place to discuss students' weaknesses and strengths in regards to writing. | Evidence of students' knowledge of the 6 traits of writing disclosed in bi-weekly writing assessment<br><br>Mock FCAT 2.0 Writing<br><br>Evaluation of teachers' lesson plans<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing results |
| | Students lack the ability to generate ideas and provide support/details. | Teachers will use document cameras and other forms of technology to model the drafting stage of the writing process.<br><br>Utilize different forms of graphic organizer/plan | Writing Coach<br>Language Arts Teachers<br>English Teachers | The Writing Coach, Language Arts, and English teachers will monitor and review bi-weekly writing prompts assessment and provides feedback to students. Focus will be adjusted as needed. | Students' bi-weekly writing prompts assessments, portfolios, and journal entries will be monitored.<br><br>Mock FCAT 2.0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | | to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning, middle, and end, using supporting details, or providing facts, and/or opinions through (concrete examples, statistics, comparisons, real life examples, anecdotes, and amazing facts) to develop focus and elaboration. | | | Writing<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing results |
| 4 | Students are deficient in the areas of organization and components of the writing process. | A school-wide planning guide will be utilized to model the writing process.<br><br>Students will evaluate various writing samples to uncover different styles of organizational writing patterns.<br><br>Students displaying minimal progress will receive small group instruction and intensive supplemental instruction. | Writing Coach Language Arts Teachers English Teachers | The Writing Coach, Language Arts, English teachers, and students will review and conference regarding students' progression, strengths and areas of improvement. | Bi-weekly writing prompts will be monitored for growth in area of need.<br><br>Mock FCAT 2.0 Writing<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing results |
| 5 | Students are deficient in the areas of organization and components of the writing process. | A school-wide planning guide will be utilized to model the writing process.<br><br>Students will evaluate various writing samples to uncover different styles of organizational writing patterns.<br><br>Students displaying minimal progress will receive small group instruction and intensive supplemental instruction.<br><br>Incorporate school-wide Mock FCAT writing prompts and include the FCAT Writing rubric during instruction. | Writing Coach Language Arts Teachers English Teachers | The Writing Coach, Language Arts, English teachers, and students will review and conference regarding students' progression, strengths and areas of improvement. | Bi-weekly writing prompts will be monitored for growth in area of need.<br><br>Mock FCAT 2.0 Writing<br><br>2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing results |

| 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Understanding FCAT Writing Rubric | 4th, 8th, and 10th Graders in Language Arts and English | Writing Coach | Language Arts & English Teachers | Bi-weekly | Teacher implementation and evaluation | Administration and Writing Coach |
| The 6 Traits of Writing | Grades 3 -10, All Subject Areas | Writing Coach | All Core Area teachers | Bi-weekly | Teacher implementation and evaluation | Administration and Writing Coach |
| Writing Across the Curriculum | Grades 3 -10, All Subject Areas | Writing Coach | All Core Area teachers | Bi-weekly | Teacher implementation and evaluation | Administration and Writing Coach |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Writing Across the Curriculum Workshop | Copying of workshop material | Title 1, Part D | $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.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

No Data Submitted

Civics Budget:

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

*End of Civics Goals*

## U.S. History End-of-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.<br><br>U.S. History Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Subtotal: $0.00 | |
| Grand Total: $0.00 | |



## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | By June 2013, 82% of (120) of the students will be in attendance during 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 84% (115) of the students have been in attendance during the 2012 school year. | 87% (116) of the students are expected to be in attendance during the 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 41%(48) of the students have excessive absences in the 2012 school year. | 38% (45) of the students will have decrease in excessive absences in the 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| There is no data to support this area. | There is no data to support this area. |

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 | School has difficulty motivating and encouraging students to stay in school. | Ongoing communication with parents.<br><br>Parent will be contacted, conferences will be arranged, and referrals to MTSS/RTI for absentee students will be issued.<br><br>Students who are in attendance daily will be rewarded through the positive school wide reward system | Administration<br>Guidance Counselor<br>Family Counselor<br>Social Worker | The RtI/MTSS team will develop and monitor the progress of school wide attendance | Attendance records |
| 2 | Lack of parental involvement and communication with the school. | Family Counselor and School Social Worker will make contact with home via phone calls and home visits while making proper referrals for services. | Administration<br>Family Counselor<br>Social Worker | The Family Counselor and Social Worker will monitor the recommendations and follow-up with parents and administration. | Attendance records |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | By June 2013, in-school and out-of-school rate of suspension will decrease by 5% through behavior modification/interventions and incentives. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| There were a total of 389 in-school suspensions in the 2012 school year. | During the 2013 school year, there will be decrease in-school suspensions by 3% (371). |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 30% (120) of the students had in-school suspension in the 2012 school year. | 25% (115) of the students will have in-school suspension in 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 35% (130) of the students had out-of-school suspension in the 2012 school year. | 30% (125) of the students will have out-of-school suspension in 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 21%(79) of the students had out-of-school suspension in the 2013 school year. | 18% (74) of the students will have out-of-school suspension in 2013 school year. |

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 | School personnel have difficulty motivating and encouraging students. | Utilize the Pine Ridge Point System with fidelity.<br><br>Increase incentives and utilization of Bulldog Bucks. | Administration<br><br>Behavior Specialist | Monitor data from the Pine Ridge Point System weekly. | MTSS/RtI data |
| 2 | Use of alternative to suspension programs are not utilized with fidelity. | Enhance existing school<br><br>based programs designed to provide alternatives for infractions. Current programs include Human Relations Council and The L.E.A.D. Program. Students will participate in individual and group counseling focusing on anger management and conflict mediation skills with Family Counselor and Guidance Counselor. | Administration<br><br>Behavior Specialist<br><br>Guidance Counselor<br><br>Family Counselor<br><br>Human Relation Advisor | Monitor student's Point System report, along with student's indoor and outdoor suspension rate data. | Student Suspension Reports Pine Ridge Point System Behavior Specialist and Family Counselor Notes & Log |
| 3 | Students lack depth of understanding of the school-wide Point System. | Conduct workshops and orientations to provide students with an overview/orientation of the Point System. | Administration Behavior Specialist | Monitor student's Point System report, along with student's indoor and outdoor suspension rate data. | Student Suspension Reports Pine Ridge Point System Behavior Specialist Notes & Log |

## 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 | Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | meetings) | | |
| Team Meeting: Behavior Strategies | K-12 | Behavior Specialist | All teachers, Administrators, Family Counselor, Behavior Technicians, Security Specialist, ESE Specialist, and Guidance Counselor. | Biweekly | Behavior Specialist and Administrators will monitor staff effectiveness of implementing strategies when dealing with students' behavior. | Behavior Specialist |
| MTSS/RtI | K-12 | ESE Specialists | All teachers, Administrators, Family Counselor, Behavior Technicians, Security Specialist, and Guidance Counselor. | Biweekly | ESE Specialist will monitor staff participation, completion for follow-up and implementation of strategies in the classrooms. | ESE Specialists |

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Dropout Prevention<br><br>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br><br>**Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: |
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |
|---|---|
| Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>**Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | By June 2013, Pine Ridge Education Center will increase the number of parent involvement through open house/back to school night, curriculum nights, SAC meetings, parent nights, parent conferences, award/recognition ceremony. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 28% of the parents participated in decisions regarding their children education as documented by attendance in Open House, monthly parent meetings, meeting and conferences. | 31% of the parents will participate in their children education as documented by attendance in Open House, monthly parent meetings, meeting and conferences. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of parent involvement with the school. | Monthly parent nights to accommodate schedules of working parents. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Parent Participation Contract | Parent conference log, Parent night sign in sheets |
| 2 | Difficulty making contact with parents. | Utilize monthly newsletters, parent link, school web site, and pinnacle to improve parent contact. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Family Counselor | Administrator will monitor postings of current events on school web site, newsletters and parent link. | Keep a log of attempts of communication with parents. |
| 3 | Lack of parent interest | Offer parent surveys to provide feedback on topics of interest for parent night meetings | Principal, Assistant Principal. | Collect/Analyze quarterly surveys from parents to offer feedback and suggestions to improve interest and communication with families.<br><br>Evaluate if percentage of participation increased from previous meetings. | Notes from Parent Night meetings/SAC meetings |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conducting Effective Parent conferences | All grade level teachers | Guidance Department & Behavior Specialist | School Wide | Weekly team meetings | Monitor logs to evaluate an increase in parent communication/involvement | Principal, Assistant Principal |
| Effectively Communicating With Parents | All grade level teachers | Guidance Department Family Counselor | School Wide | Weekly team meetings | Offer parent surveys to analyze communication between the school and home. | Principal, Assistant Principal |

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<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. CTE<br><br>CTE Goal #1: | Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Common Core Implementation | Common Core Readiness | District funded | $0.00 |
| Reading | Increase teachers' knowledge of College Board: Spring Board | Common Core Readiness | District funded | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | Professional Development for Algebra I and Geometry teachers | District Trainings | District funded | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Integrating Technology into daily instruction | On-going Promethean Board, LCD projectors, and ActivExpression Training | Title 1, Part D | $19,638.40 |
| Reading | Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $5,989.00 |
| Reading | Content Analysis: Analyzing Student Data for Student Success | On-going FileMaker Pro Training | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | Integration of technology into classroom instruction | Trainings on Promethean Boards, ActivExpression, and LCD projectors. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | Calculators for students in Algebra and Geometry classes to provide adequate practice and familiarity with technology | Scientific Calculators | Title 1, Part D | $635.88 |
| Mathematics | Renewed courses for E2020 class | Supplemental material for Algebra and Geometry EOCs | Title 1, Part D | $4,650.00 |
| Science | Students engage in real-world science experiences through the usage of technology. | Discovery Education/United Streaming virtual labs, ActivExpression, and LCD projectors. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| Science | Integrating Technology into daily instruction | Mimeo Software | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $30,913.28 |
| **Professional Development** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | The Art and Science of Teaching – Robert Marzano Best Practices for Increasing Student Achievement and Improving Instruction Deliberate Practice-Common Core | Copies of the book for all teachers | Purchased through school budget | $0.00 |
| Reading | PLCs specifically targeting the focus lesson; how to effectively differentiate instruction; how to develop higher order questions and activities; how to effectively implement the Common Core; how to develop/implement rigorous lessons. | Common Core Readiness | District provided trainings | $0.00 |
| | Provide professional development | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics | specifically targeting the focus lesson; how to effectively differentiate instruction; how to develop higher order questions and activities; how to effectively implement the Common Core State Standards; how to develop/implement rigorous lessons. | District provided trainings and workshops | District funded | $0.00 |
| Writing | Writing Across the Curriculum Workshop | Copying of workshop material | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Provide a "pull out" tutorial for six weeks prior to FCAT testing for students in small groups of 3-5 students. | Provide tutoring for six weeks before FCAT testing during the third semester. | Title 1, Part D | $28,000.00 |
| Mathematics | Provide a "pull out" tutoring for four weeks prior to FCAT testing for students in small groups of 3-5 students. | Provide tutoring for four weeks before FCAT testing during second semester. | Title 1, Part D | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $28,000.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $58,913.28 |

## 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 10/20/2012)

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Fund school initiatives, resources for project based-learning, Professional Development opportunities, classroom supplies, coverage for staff development, and provide funds for incentives. | $1,000.00 |

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

The SAC will participate in the decision making process when it aligns itself to the operation and function of the school day. Initiatives, proposals, and changes will be brought before the committee for review and insight. Parents, business partners, and stakeholders will be given an active voice during the meetings.

The SAC will do the following: give input on the development of the SIP and approve final plan, including the budget, meet on a monthly basis to review progress on school improvement objectives, advise the principal on options for changes in the SIP, where indicated, and receive an update on academic and extracurricular programs and activities each month.

## AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found