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

School Name: ESTEEM ACADEMY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Patricia Taylor

SAC Chair: Laura Wideman

Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Dr. Patricia Taylor | Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, M.A. Educational Leadership M.A. Special Education B.A. Elementary and Special Education | 2 | 20 | All administrative experience has been in special day schools for students with severe disabilities and have been non-graded. |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELA | Susan Hoover | B.A. in Social Studies<br><br>Reading and ESOL Endorsements | 3 | 3 | N/A, nongraded school. |
| Math | Kathleen Fitzgerald | M.A. Math | 8 | 5 | N/A |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1. Create a positive and supportive environment for teachers through training, coaching and frequent feedback that makes them want to be part of our school. | Principal/PLC | June 30, 2013 | |
| 2 | 2. Celebrate the successful initiative teachers use with students and encourage creativity and the enthusiasm that brings with being creative and thoughtful in practice. | Principal/PLC | June 30, 2013 | |
| 3 | 3. Provide the instructional tools/technology and professional development that will allow teachers to make substantial gains with ESTEEM students who have psychiatric/medical needs. | Principal/Department Leaders | June 30, 2013 | |
| 4 | 4. Develop interview questions for open positions that demonstrate that candidates have clear knowledge of the intensive needs of our students and have the right temperament and training to be successful with ESTEEM students. | Principal/Department Leaders | June 30, 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 |
|---|---|
| 0% (0) teachers had a less than effective and 0% (0) are teaching out-of-field. | All of the ESTEEM teachers aer certified in the areas they teach. Professional development and coaching Marzano strategies will be a major focus for all teachers. |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 0.0%(0) | 10.0%(1) | 40.0%(4) | 50.0%(5) | 30.0%(3) | 0.0%(0) | 30.0%(3) | 0.0%(0) | 20.0%(2) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| n/a--no new teachers | | | |

# 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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

Eligible students participate in the Free/Reduced meal program.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Students participate in the Personal Career Planning Curriculum. They participate in The National Cities Competition. All high school students keep a college portfolio to insure they are meeting all of the requirements for a Bright Futures scholarhip, they research college requirements and match their credits and G.P.A. to what is needed for colleges they are interested in, and they work on their applications and essays.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Students in this program all have a mental health diagnosis. Through a partnership with Tri-County Associates, all students get individual weekly therapy, group therapy, and all families get monthly sessions.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS leadership team is comprised of the principal, the instructional support teachers, case managers and PLC team leaders.

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 meets every Friday morning to discuss schoolwide, department, or individual student concerns. The team clearly defines the problem/situation in measurable terms and determines if the issue is systemic, impacts a team or is unique to one or more individuals at ESTEEM. That determines how the problem will be approached. Based on the data, we collaboratively develop a hypothesis as to the reason the problem is occurring. We brainstorm ways of addressing the problem to develop a strong plan and then we work with the implementers to design a strategic plan. We monitor the plan throughout the implementation and analysis process and make adjustments as are needed.

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

The MTSS leadership team works with the SAC to determine ways to address our non-negotiable items and collects and analyzes our data. This group creates a draft SIP that is brought back to the school. The departments analyze data down to the grade and student level, and addresses specific strategies to be used in each subject area based on the disaggregated data reports for areas needing more intensive attention. These areas are addressed in the RtI problem-solving process. All students at ESTEEM have IEPs, so RtI goes hand-in-hand with creating student IEPs. The draft SIP is then built and brought back to the SIP/MTSS leadership team for refinement and approval.

### 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.

We use district sanctioned diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments on an ongoing basis. We use a lot of Curriculum Based Academic Monitoring (CBAM) daily or weekly as well as individual monitoring (BIPs, IEPs, point sheets, etc.). Our pyramid, if looked at through a traditional lens, would be inverted because in our setting we serve the 5% in the population that is in the district's third tier of the pyramid. One hundred percent of our students need individualized or small group assistance throughout the day. Five percent would do well without that level of intervention by virtue of being in a small, specialized program. Therefore, we begin with high level of supports as our tier 1 and make a decision tree for every intervention we have in place that will lead us to the even more specialized tier two and three interventions. It is a far more intensive and extensive process than the normal pyramid. All of our students are discussed weekly by teachers and therapists in team treatment meetings to assess the efficacy of the mental health interventions and instructional programming we have put into place. We make regular adjustments as needed (more therapy, one-on-one assistance, re-teaching, modifications or adaptations, etc.).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff is familiar with using FCIM and RtI, and PEER IEP development, so MTSS will serve as a tool to ensure fidelity of services. We will use a train-the-trainer model for staff members who have been trained in RtI, PBS, and Person-Centered Planning. Staff will also be given copies of MTSS Implementation Components: Ensuring common language and understanding to guide them while implementing the process.

The principal and support staff will work with full-time Esteem Academy staff to help expand services, find resources, and help monitor the RtI process.
Weekly PLC summaries will show progress on RtI and will highlight supports needed to administration.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The principal and leadership team will model the MTSS process and use it to guide staff problem solving. The principal will conduct data talks with the ESTEEM PLC and monitor the data, intervention, and implementation sufficiency.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The principal, ELA, CRT, speech, ESOL, and gifted teachers make up the school-based LLT.

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

The LLT analyzes grade level and individual students' data (FCAT, FAIR, Jamestown, MyAccess, Accelerated Reader, etc.) to determine what is working and what supports or interventions need to be put in place for areas of weakness. LLT members support classroom teachers at ESTEEM with strategies to support reading in content areas (Marzano's high yield strategies, Fail-Safe Literacy, Ruby Payne's mental models, etc.). They meet with PLCs for data chats to develop and monitor MTSS. The role of the LLT is to support teachers, monitor student responses to intervention, model strategies through lesson studies, as well as provide direct instruction to students.

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

Our students' lowest rate of growth last year was in the area of writing, so that will be an area of focus this year. Students will be required to produce expository, persuasive, and narrative types of essays. We will also focus on preparing for ELA CCSS and making sure students are reading challenging informational writings from primary sources and that they are looking for evidence in their reading to support their answers to questions.

All of our students have IEPs, and we will ensure that the IEP goals address insuring students have access to instruction focused on the District's Eleven Essential Outcomes. The team will look for research-based resources to support interventions.

Students will give oral presentations to their class and other invitees.

Students will participate in producing a school newsletter and yearbook.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

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

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

N/A

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All ESTEEM teachers in all classes teach reading strategies to support content reading fluency and comprehension. All subject area teachers also require students to write and they score the writing on a common rubric.
All of our students have IEPs that address the learning styles, needs, and strategies that best meet the needs of each individual. Our small class sizes and our weekly meetings that allows us to look at student data make it immediately evident when a student is struggling with reading and needs extra assistance or intensive reading services.

All of our teachers are trained to teach reading in the content areas and they are conscientious about implementation with fidelity. Intensive reading consultants will work with teachers to develop strategies and/or make adaptations to instructional delivery when a student has a problem during the week based on weekly data collection. They may also provide one-on-one assistance when necessary.
All teachers meet to talk about individual student progress and to develop academic vocabulary lists to use across all content areas.
Teachers analyze FAIR data and pinpointed areas they will address with groups of students and they developed a plan for monitoring these across curricula.

## *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?

Teachers collaborate using vertical alignment to assure that relevant instruction is given to ensure the students are working towards their Individual Education Plan goals. Since ESTEEM students enter the school throughout the school year, as part of their entering the school at each student's initial IEP meeting, we discuss their medical/psychiatric needs, therapies needed and their goals for the future. The student participates in the process. Part of the IEP process is to find out from the student where he or she wants to do after high school. We discuss college and career readiness and all options of each and how to meet graduation requirements to best facilitate this goal.

The core subject curricula have integrated Benchmarks. Teachers work together in develop units and lesson plans that incorporate these benchmarks in a systematic manner around thematic units. Mindfulness about insuring instruction that offers rigor, relevance, and relationship keeps the focus on providing lessons that are built on student concerns and demonstrating how immediate learning is part of a building block for scaffolding learning leading to long term career and life goals.

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?

Students participate in the Personal Career Planning Curriculum through their Social Studies and Research classes. Teachers work towards guiding the students in our focus area of being College and Career Ready by graduation. All IEP goals are written with the individual students' needs in mind. The student participates in the meeting in which he or she is asked what goals they have for the future. We use this information to develop curricular objectives. We work with the student to determine ways they can pursue electives in their interest area as well as ways to recover credits missed due to their medical/psychiatric condition.
Students are participating in the nationalist Cities Competition to address STEM (projectwww.futurecity.org).
Students participate in project learning which requires them to develop a plan for completing their project. They have to use creativity, organization, planning, self-monitoring, and time management behaviors in order to successfully complete their projects.

## 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

High school students develop portfolios to help them understand the requirements for different colleges and tech schools. They track their course work to ensure they have credits needed for Bright Futures scholarships, community service hours, school applications, and essays. We try to prepare students by providing counseling for college (all of our graduating seniors from the 2011-2012 school year went to college.) We also have partnered with Kiwanis to provide leadership training to our middle and high school students.

The High School Feedback Report analysis does not give us much useful information because our program is meant to be short-term support for students who are temporarily in Hospital Homebound. The goal at ESTEEM is to provide academic and social-emotional support that gives students the necessary life skills, while maintaining academic momentum, to transition to a traditional school setting.

There are only a few students at each grade level who take the FCAT and/or EOC exam and are with us from October to February because they are staffed with us for a finite time period. The numbers we get are not statistically significant (e.g. if only two students are tested at a grade level and they both pass the FCAT, it is misleading to say 100% of our students are successful. Next year two students may take it and fail and we would have a 100% failure rate). We can look at trends over time, but the best information comes from more individualized case studies. Nonetheless, student readiness for the public postsecondary level is addressed annually (or more often) with every students at the student's IEP meeting. Students in middle and high school are able to use their ePEP for planning and decision-making. Additionally, all students who are 14 or

older develop a detailed transition plan during the development of their IEPs.

# 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: | Students will be challenged with more nonfiction reading and teachers have been training to challenge students with higher order thinking strategies. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38%(11/29)of students scored at FCAT Reading Level 3. | By June 2013, 41% (12/29)of ESTEEM students will score Level 3 on the FCAT 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 | 1A.1.<br>Limited instructional time due to students' medical conditions. 1A.1. | Students use grade level instructional materials for all core curricula. Project-based learning is used to enhance core instruction. | Classroom teachers | Teachers will monitor students' growth weekly through portfolios, PLC data, and lesson study. | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher; FAIR data; Mini-assessments; CBAM; project rubrics; standardized tests; action research |
| 2 | Psychiatric/medical conditions that interfere with learning. | Classroom teacher | Teachers will monitor students' growth weekly | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher; with FAIR data | Mini-assessments; CBAM; project rubrics; standardized tests; action research |
| 3 | The intensive mental health needs of the students at ESTEEM interfere with students' ability to perform consistently. | Students will use grade level instructional materials for all core curricula. Progress monitoring will be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention.<br>Credit Recovery and FLVS will be used to keep students on par with their cohort group.Students' mental health needs will be considered when interventions are designed. | Language Arts and Reading teachers | Teachers will monitor students' growth.<br>Student needs will be discussed at IEP meetings and at PLCs. | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher<br>FAIR data<br>Mini-assessments |
| 4 | The choice of reading materials within each classroom needs to be expanded. Additional focus will be placed on reading in the content areas. | Establish classroom libraries in each instructional classroom with course related books.<br>Teachers will begin to implement lesson study in the areas of reading and | CRT<br>classroom teachers | Teachers will monitor that students are engaged in SSR (silent sustained reading) during appropriate times and that they utilize the libraries for enrichment | Teacher observation, District and State assessments, Writing Rubrics |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | writing across the curriculum | | | |
| 5 | Teachers in singleton schools do not have the opportunity to work collaboratively with peers teaching the same level. | Teachers will begin Lesson Study using reading and writing skills across the curriculum and develop rubrics for responding to text. | ESTEEM Teachers<br><br>CRT | Student comprehension scores will increase and student writing will be monitored in all classes. | FAIR<br><br>Teacher rubrics<br><br>FCAT Reading and Writing |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | High performing students will be provided curriculum and instruction to keep their performance above proficiency level for their grade. Level 4 & 5 students will be offered an opportunity to work on the school newspaper and yearbook to enhance reading, editing and writing strategies. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 17% (4/24) of the students at ESTEEM scored at Level 4 or above in Reading. | 25% (6/24) of students at ESTEEM will score at Level 4 or 5 in Reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Having one or two gifted or high-performing students can skew the data from year to year as can the mental health situation of students at the time of testing. | Students performing above proficiency level will be provided opportunities to participate in enrichment activities in their core curriculum courses and by engaging in supplemental activities planned by the gifted studies teacher. | Language Arts & Gifted teachers | Teachers will monitor students' growth. Student needs will be discussed at IEP meetings and at PLCs. | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher<br>FAIR data |
| | Students need multiple real-world reading challenges with | All students scoring at Level 4 or 5 are enrolled in a critical thinking | Gifted Teacher | Students will research topics and create projects that show their | Portfolio Assessment |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | opportunities to apply to use their skills beyond direct instruction in the classroom. | course. | | depth of knowledge. | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | The growth made last year (29%)of our students compared to the previous year (85%)of our students we have identified are making progress in reading, so we will continue with intensive reading strategies. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 29% (7/24) of students made Learning Gains in reading on the 2011 FCAT. | By July 2013, 50% of (24) students will make learning gains on the FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The barrier is not whether individual students can make gains, but whether the data accurately reflects the progress of individual students.<br>We often lack prior year data on our students to be able to document learning gains. 33% of last year's tested students had no match to prior year data.<br>Students in ESTEEM frequently have been out of the mainstream for at | Certified reading teachers will identify each student's strengths and weaknesses and will provide remedial instruction using research-based materials. | Reading teachers | Teachers will administer ongoing diagnostic and formative assessments. | Formative assessment administered by the classroom teacher;<br>FAIR data<br>Edusoft mini-assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | least a year due to medical/psychiatric issues<br>. | | | | |
| 2 | Teachers are at ESTEEM for part of the day which makes it challenging for seamless communication to take place. | Time will be provided for teachers to collaborate and to analyze student data and develop strategies for individual students. | Principal<br>Literacy Team | Student time on task<br><br>teacher observations<br><br>formal and informal data collection | RtI data collection tool<br><br>Fair data<br><br>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: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | Our lowest 25% is comprised of 5 Level 1 learners and 1 level 2 learner. Of those 6 students, 1 student made a learning gane. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n.a. | n.a. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Our student demographics are changing. 65% of our students are ESE thus needed additional educational strategies that meet their specific learning needs. There are no ESE certified teachers at ESTEEM. | Make sure teachers are receiving ESE teacher support. Make sure all low-performing ESE students are enrolled intensive reading with learning strategies infused. | Principal<br>General Education teachers | Analyze progress on IEP benchmarks weekly and on state monitoring assessments. | Student IEPs<br><br>Monthly monitoring<br><br>Data analysis worksheet |
| | Students who are level 1 | Offer tutoring support | Teachers | Students will complete | Student weekly |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | or level 2 need opportunities for additional one-to-one assistance | twice a week for students who need help keeping up. | | assignments with support. This will be documented. | progress/levels sheets. |
| 3 | Teachers need more dedicated time for collaboration. | Analyze the data we receive from the FAIR testing. We will look at the reading.ocps.net website and how to use the progress monitoring tools located there. We will also discuss the OCPS K-12 Literacy Plan which is our guiding plan for reading across the curriculum. | Reading PLC<br><br>Principal<br><br>CRT<br><br>RtI Team | Data will be kept and intervention plans will be developed based on data. Progress will be monitored monthly. | FAIR Tests<br><br>Notebooks<br><br>FCAT |

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 : ESTEEM Academy will reduce the achievement gap in reading for all students by moving 59% on grade level in 2010-11 to 100% mastery in 2016-17

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Esteem Academ | Hospital Homeb | Hospital Homeb | Hospital Homeb | Hospital Homeb | |

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: | Our school population is too small to disaggregate data into ethnic subgroups, although in general our Black students outscored their peers. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n.a. | n.a. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gaps in reading instruction | Content area teams of teachers will discuss strategies at PLC meeting and plan integrated curriculum. | PLC's and Leadership Team | Bi-weekly PLC meetings to determine appropriate Lesson Studies and curriculum design, taking into account the test specifications, deconstructing standards and STEM lessons | Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |
| 2 | ESTEEM Academy students have medical/psychiatric barriers that impede learning. | Use components of core and supplemental curriculum to build background knowledge and strengthen basic skills. | CRT and Instructional Coach | PLC discussion groups will determine effectiveness of strategies through teacher observation and data collection | Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative 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 reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | There are no ELL students currently represented at ESTEEM Academy. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n.a. | n.a. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | Students with Disabilities will increase their performance on FCAT by 3 Percent annually. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 29% of SWD students taking FCAT reading assessment were proficient and scored Level 3 and above | In June 2013, 35% of SWD students taking FCAT reading assessment will be proficient and score Level 3 and above |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The students attend ESTEEM Academy because they have critical psychiatric health issues in addition to their disabilities. | We will continue to address this in PLCs to insure we are looking at the learning needs of each and every student. We will offer increased intensive reading for struggling students and advanced students will be enrolled in Critical Thinking classes. | Teachers, Reading teachers, CRT, Gifted teachers, Guidance Counselor | Regular Education teachers will monitor progress, record data on consultative form and discuss effectiveness at PLC meetings.<br>CBM<br>District formative assessments | Consultation Forms and reading assessments<br>FAIR<br>FCAT |

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: | Economically Disadvantaged students will increase their performance on FCAT by 3 Percent annually. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 50% 912/24)) of economically disadvantaged students taking FCAT reading assessment were proficient and scored Level 3 and above | In June 2013, 55%% of economically disadvantaged students taking FCAT reading assessment were proficient and scored Level 3 and above |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Economically Disadvantaged students tend to not have access to technology and/or the necessary support at home. | ESTEEM Academy is committed to providing intensive reading for the Level 1 and level 2 students. | Principal, teachers, reading teachers, CRT | IEP Team composed of teachers will determine need at staffing | Edusoft, FAIR, FCAT |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My Access! | K-12 | CRT | All Teachers | August 2012 | PLC Meetings, Team Meetings | CRT |
| Penda | 6-12 | Science Teacher | Science & Math Teachers | September 2012 | PLC Meetings | Science TeamLeader |
| Common Core | K-12 | CC Team | All Teachers | October 2012 | Bi-weekly Data Meetings | CRT |
| Marzano Design Questions 2,5 7, 8 | All teachers Team | Principal | All teachers | October 2012 ongoing | I-Observation | Leadership |
| Text Complexity and Deconstructing the Standards | K-12 | CC Team | All Teachers | November 2012 | PLC Meetings | Leadership Team |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| 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: | n/a |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| n/a | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | n/a |

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |
|---|
| n/a |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | Students who are on grade level in mathematics will be placed in appropriate courses to allow them to continue to engage in mathematics instruction that is commensurate with their level of achievement. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22% (4/18) students performed at FCAT level 3 in mathematics | By July 2012, 27% (5/18)of all ESTEEM students will score at Level 3 or above |

Problem-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 | Because of the medical/psychiatric needs of our students, many of our students have learning gaps as a result of missing so much school. Closing this learning gap is challenging for the instructional staff. | Students will use grade level instructional materials for all core curricula. Progress monitoring will be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention | Mathematics Teachers | Teachers will monitor students' growth. Student needs will be discussed at IEP meetings and at PLCs. | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher<br>Benchmark data<br>Mini-assessments |
| 2 | The demographics have changed and there is a higher number of students with learning disabilities at ESTEEM Academy. | Include teachers who have experience working with students who have learning needs. | Principal | Data collection on learning benchmarks and RtI results | Benchmark Testing<br><br>FCAT |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | All educators will stress improvement in skills through increased fluency and basic mathematical operations. Conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 0% (0/8) of all students in ESTEEM scored at Level 4 or 5 in FCAT Mathematics | By June 2013, 25% (2/8) of all students at ESTEEM will score at Level 4 or 5 in FCAT Math |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The high mobility of students at this school causes great variations in the profile of our population and in the individual needs of the students. Therefore the needs of our above proficiency students must be addressed on an individual basis and not targeting a large population. | High-performing students will be placed in courses providing rigorous instruction. Enhancement activities will include practice with FCAT Explorer. | Math teachers | Teachers will monitor students' growth. Student needs will be discussed at IEP meetings and at PLCs. | Ongoing formative assessments by the teacher Benchmark data Mini-assessments |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Because of the medical/psychiatric needs of our students, many of our students have learning gaps as a result of missing so much school. Closing this learning gap is challenging for the instructional staff. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 13% of students (1/8) made learning gains in math on the 2012 FCAT. | By June 2013, 50% of students will make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The small population, the ongoing enrollment, and the high mobility of students at ESTEEM causes great variations in the profile of our school and in the individual needs of the students. Therefore the needs of all our students must be addressed on an individual basis and not targeting a large population. | Certified mathematics teachers will identify each student's strengths and weaknesses and focus instruction on bridging the gaps. Struggling learners will receive Tier 2 intervention of additional , intensive, small group instruction. | Math teachers Math Coach | Teachers will monitor students' growth. | ongoing formative teacher assessments; Benchmark Tests; Mini-assessments |
| 2 | There has been a large increase in ESE students placed at ESTEEM. These students need the support of a teacher who can meet their intense needs and provide learning strategies to assist students as they learn | Replace select teachers with teachers who are skilled at providing learning strategies and intensive support | Principal | Data notebooks will be maintained to monitor student response to intervention | Benchmark Tests<br><br>FCAT |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | Because of the medical/psychiatric needs of our students, many of our students have learning gaps as a result of missing so much school. Closing this learning gap is |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #4: | challenging for the instructional staff.<br>Our lowest students scale scores were in the 100-225 range. These students are missing basic knowledge. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| By June 2012, 0% None of our lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics | By June 2013, 33% (3) of our lowest 25% students will make learning gains 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 | The barrier to increasing proficiency of our lowest students is a lack of prerequisite math skills and the students' lack of confidence in their ability to learn. | All Level 1 & Level 2 learners will be provided additional intensive instruction in mathematics in a small group setting. | Mathematics teacher | Teachers will monitor students' growth with ongoing diagnostic and formative assessments. Student needs will be discussed at IEP meetings and at PLCs. | Formative assessments administered by the classroom teacher.<br>Benchmark data<br>Edusoft mini-assessments |
| 2 | Students at this level need individual learning supports | All learners at level 1 and 2 will be enrolled in intensive math courses. | ESTEEM math teachers | Teachers and students will review where the student is on the scale each day | Benchmark Assessments<br><br>Teacher scales<br><br>FCAT |

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 #<br>5A : We need to increase math skills for our students. All educators will stress improvement in skills through increased fluency and basic mathematical operations. |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 25% (2/8) of our | 40% (3/8) of our | 60% (5/8) of our | 75% (6/8) of our | 85% (7/8) of our | |

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: | While the number of students (8) took the middle school FCAT mathematics exam, it is difficult to totally break down the student subgroups. We need to increase math skills for our students. All educators will stress improvement in skills through increased fluency and basic mathematical operations. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 75% (6/8) scored at a level 1 or level 2 in mathematics.<br><br>White: 4/6<br>Black:1/1<br>Hispanic:1/1<br>Asian:0/0<br>American Indian: | White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers need additional resources to maintain student motivation as students will be spending more time on math instruction | Add technologyliteracy (include online training for textbook resources) | Math department<br><br>CRT<br><br>Principal | RtI/FCIM | Benchmark Tests<br><br>FCAT<br><br>Teacher/Student survey |
| 2 | Gaps in math instruction due to medical/psychiatric condition of the students. | Content area teams of teachers will discuss strategies at PLC meeting and plan integrated curriculum. | Professional Learning Communities and Leadership Team | Bi-weekly PLC meetings to determine appropriate Lesson Studies and curriculum design, taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and STEM lessons | Edusoft and ongoing formative 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: | There are no ELL students at ESTEEM Academy during the current school year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n.a. | n.a. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | 100% of students who did not make satisfactory progress on the FCAT mathematics exam have a disability.<br>We need to emphasize math skills in the home since all of our students are hospitalized or homebound. All educators will stress improvement in skills through increased fluency and basic mathematical operations. Conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 25% (2/8) of middle school students scored Level 3 or above on FCAT | 40% of middle school students will score Level 3 or above on FCAT |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiated instruction; assign alternate activity | Classroom teacher | Teachers will develop their own concrete , measurable data collection process | Ongoing formative assessments | FCAT 2.0 |

| 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: | We need to emphasize math skills at ESTEEM Academy. All educators will stress improvement in skills through increased fluency and basic mathematical operations. Conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. 100% of our students qualify for FRL. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 25% (2/8) scored Level 3 or above on FCAT | 40% (3/8) will score Level 3 or above on FCAT |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiated instruction; assign alternate activity | Classroom teacher | Teachers will develop their own concrete , measurable data collection process | Ongoing formative assessments | FCAT 2.0. |

*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: | n/a |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| .<br>0% (0/3) students scored Level 3 on the EOC exam | 25% of students will score Level 3 of |

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 | Student medical/psychiatric health issues impede learning. | Differential instruction of algebra to address achievement gaps. | CRT Placement Specialist | Algebra benchmark tests. Monitor course marks | End of course exam<br><br>Teacher made assessments and students will complete a biannual math design challenge |

| 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: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% of students scored Level 4 or 5 | 14% of students will score a Level 4 or 5 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Student medical/psychiatric health issues impede learning. | Increase opportunties for algebra to be taught through differentiated instruction to close learning gaps. | CRT | Algebra benchmark tests. | End of course exam |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | Algebra Goal #<br>3A : It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 0% of students | 25% of students | 40% of students | 60% of students | 80% of 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 subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3B: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3C: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Currently there are no ELL students at ESTEEM Academy | there are no ELL students at ESTEEM Academy |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass algebra and the End of Course Exam. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 0% (0/3) economically disadvantaged students passed the EOC exam | 25% of the economically disadvantaged students will pass the EOC exam |

Problem-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 | Because of the students medical/psychiatric needs coupled with the economically depressed home situations the learning gap for grasping algebra is huge. | IEP team will make determination about level and means of instruction for the student. | IEP Team, CRT | Benchmark Assessments | EOC exam |



## 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: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18% (2/11) scored Level 3 or above on the EOC exam | 27% (3/11) will score at Level 3 or above on the EOC exam |

Problem-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 | Because of student medical/psychiatric needs grasping the concepts of geometry are challenging due to a huge learning gap. | .<br>Increase differentiated instruction of geometry to meet the learning needs of our students. | Teachers and Leadership Team | Geometry benchmarks. | EOC exam |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% scored Level 4 or 5 on the EOC exam | 25% will score at Level 4/5 on the EOC exam |

| Problem-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 | Because of student medical/psychiatric needs grasping the concepts of geometry are challenging due to a huge learning gap. | Increase differentiated instruction of geometry to meet the learning needs of our students. | Teachers and Leadership Team | Geometry benchmarks. | EOC exam |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Geometry Goal #<br>3A : It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. | | | |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 35% of Esteem | 55% of Esteem | 75% of Esteem | 90% of Esteem | |

| 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: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3C: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| There are no ELL students currently at ESTEEM Academy. | There are no ELL students currently at ESTEEM Academy. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3D: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3E: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass geometry and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

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



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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Penda | 6-12 | Penda Trainer | Science & Math Teachers | September 2012 | PLC Meetings | Science Team Leader |

Mathematics Budget:

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | Twelve students took the FCAT Science test. It is difficult to draw conclusions from such a small data sample; however, based on teacher input, the students would benefit by having more lab-based learning opportunities. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 41% (5/12) students achieved proficiency on the 2011 FCAT Science test | By June 2013, 50% (3/6)of the students taking FCAT science will achieve proficiency on 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 lack opportunities to enage in lab-based activities. | Increase opportunities for lab-based activities. | Classroom teacher; CRT | Various hands-on projects will be used to gauge students' comprehension. | FCAT Explorer; Benchmark assessments; Ongoing |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | formative assessments |
| 2 | All learners need stimulating resources to make connections to prior learning and to actively engage in learning. | Provide high interest supplementary reading materials to make content areas come alive. | Classroom teacher;<br>CRT | Action research by the classroom teacher | Teachers' journals and/or anecdotal records to measure student engagement |
| 3 | Students who have reading difficulties may struggle to comprehend science texts efficiently | Incorporate reading strategies into the content area | LiteracyTeam<br><br>Science teachers<br><br>CRT | Vocabulary tests<br><br>Reading fluency in content area | End-of-Course Exams<br><br>FCAT |

| 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: | Twelve students took the FCAT Science test. It is difficult to draw conclusions from such a small data sample; however, based on teacher input, the students would benefit by having more lab-based learning opportunities. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0/12) scored at Level 4,5, or 6 in 2012. | 25% (3/12) will score at Level 4, 5, or 6 in 2013. |

Problem-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 science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | Twelve students took the FCAT Science test. It is difficult to draw conclusions from such a small data sample; however, based on teacher input, the students would benefit by having more lab-based learning opportunities. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0/12) made above proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Science test | 25% (3/12) will score above proficience on the 2013 FCAT science 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 | Because the site is so small, students do not have a wide variety of advanced courses from which to choose | Offer more challenging courses through FLVS while giving the students instructional support | CRT<br><br>Gifted teachers<br><br>Science PLC | Curriculum-Based Assessments<br><br>Student work samples | End-of-Course exams<br><br>FCAT |
| 2 | Inquiry-based exploratory model difficult to implement with no science lab | Use virtual labs and more hands-on projects to teach content e.g. | Science Teacher<br><br>Gifted Teacher | Curriculum-Based Assessments<br><br>Student work samples | End-of-Course exams<br><br>FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | explorelearning.com (gizmos, P.he.t.)) | | | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring | |

| | |
|---|---|
| at or above Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

## Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.<br><br>Biology Goal #1: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass biology and the End of Course Exam. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 45% (5/11) scored Level 3 on the EOC exam. | 55% (6/11) will score a Level 3 on the EOC exam. |

Problem-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 | Because of student medical/psychiatric needs grasping the concepts of biology are challenging due to a huge learning gap. | Increase differentiated instruction of biology to meet the learning needs of our students. | Teachers and Leadership Team | Biology benchmarks. | EOC exam |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.<br><br>Biology Goal #2: | It is a state requirement for all students to pass biology and the End of Course Exam. However, the sample group of unique populations are too small to be significant. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 0% (0/11) scored at Level 4 or 5 on the biology EOC exam. | 25% (3/11) will score at Level 4 or 5 on the biology EOC exam. |

| Problem-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 | Because of student medical/psychiatric needs grasping the concepts of biology are challenging due to a huge learning gap. | Increase differentiated instruction of biology to meet the learning needs of our students. | Teachers and Leadership Team | Biology benchmarks. | EOC exam |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tecnology Trainings | k-12 Science | Dept. Chairs | Science Dept. | As offered (OCPS, FDLRS) | Dept. meeting minutes Professional Dev. evaluations | Dept. chairs Professional Dev. facilitator |
| Moving Science into the Mainstream: CCSS | K-12 Science | Dept.Chairs | Science Dept. | As offered (OCPS, FDLRS) | Dept. meeting minutes' Professional Dev. evaluations | Dept. chairs |
| Penda | 6-12 | Penda Trainer | Science & Math Teachers | September 2012 | PLC Meetins | Science Team Leader |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $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: | Writing skills will be incorporated into all core content and elective courses. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 57% (10/18) scored at level 3.0 or higher in writing | By June 2013, 66% (12/18) of the students taking FCAT writing will score at level 3 or above. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The barrier to achieving proficiency in writing is a lack of prerequisite skills with our low performing students | Students will receive additional writing instruction through a journalism class and will use Write Source as an instructional resource. | Language Arts teachers | Language arts teachers will monitor students' progress and provide ongoing feedback to students. | Students will be given writing assignments which will be assessed using the FCAT scoring rubric |
| 2 | Students need multiple opportunities to write across the curriculum. This has not been an explicit expectation. | Each student will write in a journal every day using Robert DuFour's model | All Teachersin PLCs<br><br>CRT<br><br>Principal | Fcat Writing Scoring resources alternating months between expository and narrative writing. | Writing rubric<br><br>FCAT Writing |
| 3 | Students tend to stay comfortable with writing simple sentences and using low-level transitions because writing is a struggle for them. | Increase expectations and rigor and make this motivating by writing for a real-world purpose (newsletter, year book or other publication for a wide audience). | ELA teachers | Use MyAccess! assessment feedback as well as teacher feedback | MyAccess! and quality of newsletters and year book |

| 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: | |
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My Access! | K-12 | Vantage Trainer | All teachers | August 2012 | PLC Meetings, Team Meetings | CRT |
| Write Traits and/or Write for the Future | Middle-High | District | ELA teachers | Oct-May | PLC Meetings Lesson planning | LLT |
| Scoring Writing Assessments training | Middle-High | District | Two ELA teachers and coach | Oct.-Nov. | Inter-rater reliability checks | LLT |
| Refocus on Write Source texts and workbooks | Tier 2 Middle-High | ELA Coach | Intensive reading teachers | Oct. - May | Monthly assessment of writing samples | PLC |
| Hold PLC writing focus book study/research strategies discussions | Middle-High | ELA Coach | ELA teachers | Nov. and Feb. | Survey what teachers have successfully implemented as a result of these discussions | CRT |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

## 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 |

*End of U.S. History EOC Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Student's medical/psychiatric condition makes it difficult for them to attend school on a regular basis. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 88.48% (33/38) | 92.48% (36/40) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 29% (11/38) | 36/40 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| No students have more than 10 (excessive) tardies. | No students will have (10 excessive) tardies |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students' medical/mental health issues are the major reason for their absences. | The ESTEEM staff will emphasize the attendance policy. The importance of regular attendance will be reinforced by each teacher. | Staffing Specialist and ESTEEM staff. | The ESTEEM – PLC will develop a process for providing and RtI plan to address all absences. The plan will include interventions at all levels. | Attendance records |
| 2 | ESTEEM is not a neighborhood school, so if a student misses the bus or has a doctor's appointment, they miss the whole day because they cannot walk to school | Teachers and staff will work with students and parents to educate them on consistent attendance as we work toward preparing them for a less restrictive environment | Administrative team | Administrative team will insure child study team meetings are held and supports are put into place when students are frequently absent | Attendance records |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | When students miss school, they fall behind and do not want to come back because they feel they cannot catch up. | Provide extra support/tutoring for students who have fallen behind because of absenteeism | Guidance Counselor<br>Dean of Students<br>Principla | Time sheets and work samples | Attendance rate<br><br>Grades |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $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: | We need to continue to improve our strategies for recognizing when a student is in distress and intervene at that point. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |

| | |
|---|---|
| The total number of in school suspensions in 2012 was 6. | The total number of expected in school suspensions in 2013 is expected to be less than 6. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| There were 5 in-school suspensions in 2012. | The expectation is that there will be fewer than 5 in-school suspensions in 2013. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| There was 11 out-of-school suspension in 2012. | By June 2013, fewer than 11 out-of-school school suspensions are expected. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| There was 6 student suspended out of school in 2012. | The expectation is that there will be fewer than 6 students suspended out of school in 2013. |

Problem-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 teacher training in working with students with psychiatric diagnoses. | Teachers will participate in staff development for RtI. | Principal | Review of notes from the ESTEEM PLC; Monitoring of disciplinary actions | Discipline records |
| 2 | Many of our students come from poverty and have other complicating issues. | Teachers will learn more about the resources these children need through inservice training | Principal | Review of notes from the ESTEEM PLC; Monitoring of disciplinary actions | Discipline records<br><br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Suspension Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $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.* | The students at ESTEEM Academy are here because they are too medically/psychiatrically fragile to be served in their zoned schools. We need to insure our school is as supportive and stress-free as can make be. |
| 2012 Current Dropout Rate: | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate: |
| The drop-out rate for the 2012 school year was 0%. | We do not expect any dropouts for the 2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Graduation Rate: | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate: |
| All eligible students graduated with their cohort group in the 2011-2012. | The expected graduation rate for 2013 is 100%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students come to us because they have missed a lot of school due to their medical/psychiatric condition. | Provide additional supports such as credit-recovery and FLVS with instructional support to move students forward. | Principal<br><br>CRT | Monitor completion rate on credit-recovery and FLVS to see if students were able to complete course work | Grades<br>Transdripts |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Dropout Prevention Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $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.* | We will maintain full accessibility to our all of our ESTEEM parents. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 100% of parents participated in the development of their child’s IEP. Eighty-five percent participated in at least one of the following: open-house, school awards ceremonies, graduation. | We will continue to have 100% of parents participating in school activities and will offer more opportunities for participation this year. |
| 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 | The distance from parents' homes and/or workplaces to our office and/or to the ESTEEM campus is sometimes a barrier to participation. | Opportunities to participate will be offered during the day as well as in the evening to afford more flexibility for participating in school events. | Principal<br>Dean of students | Records of attendance will be kept | Attendance records;<br>Parent feedback through end-of-year survey |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM | |

| | |
|---|---|
| STEM Goal #1: | STEM goals have been infused into math and science content areas. Technology is being utilized at ESTEEM. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Due to our student's medical/psychiatric health issues learning is impeded due to their condition. | Differential instruction of technology to address achievement gaps. | CRT Technology teacher | Monitor course marks End of course exam | Teacher made assessments and students will complete a technology portfolio |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Penda | 6-12 | Penda Trainer | Science & Math Teachers | September 2012 | PLC Meetings | Science Team Leader |

STEM Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| n/s | n/a | n/a | $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: | As part of the curriculum at ESTEEM Academy, students explore career, college and technical education goals as part of their transition from high school to post-secondary education. The goal is for all students to know what they want to pursue regarding this post-secondary training and education. |

Problem-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 | Student's medical/psychiatric health issues impede opportunities for exploration of career and technical/college goals. | Differential instruction to encourage students to fully research post-secondary options. | CRT<br>Teachers | Monitor student's portfolio | Teacher made assessments and students will complete portfolio of materials they have explored. |

---

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

---

CTE Budget:

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

## 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 | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CELLA | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Science | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Writing | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Attendance | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Suspension | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| STEM | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CTE | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CELLA | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Science | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Writing | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Attendance | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Suspension | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| STEM | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CTE | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CELLA | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Science | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Writing | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Attendance | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Suspension | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| STEM | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CTE | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CELLA | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Mathematics | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Science | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Writing | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Attendance | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Suspension | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| STEM | n/s | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| CTE | n/a | n/a | n/a | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ○ Priority | ○ Focus | ○ Prevent | ● NA |

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Training and materials for parents to inform them about preparing for career and college opportunities for their middle and high school children | $300.00 |

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

The first meeting of the year was held at Nemours Children's Hospital and discussed ways the SAC and hospital could jointly serve the students and families that both organizations serve in common. Seven more meetings are scheduled throughout the year. The SAC will get updates from school team leaders to insure the plan is being implemented with fidelity and will use FCIM in areas where implementation hits barriers because of resource issues. The SAC will hold a retreat in the spring to close out current goals and plan for next year.

## 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