

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: LANIER-JAMES EDUCATION CENTER

District Name: Broward

Principal: Kelvin Lee

SAC Chair: Tami Taylor Johnson

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/04/12

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Brown Abraham	A.A. Liberal Arts B.S. Computer Science M.S. Ed. Leadership Certified Math 5-9 Certified Computer Science K-12 Certified ESE K-12 Certified Ed. Leadership - All Levels	2	5	Assistant principal, Lanier-James Education Center 2011 - 2012 School rating 2011 -2012, no rating Whispering Pines 2008-2009, Writing scores increased by 50% from previous year. The Quest Center 2009-2010, AYP: 87% criteria met The Quest Center 2010-2011, AYP: 85% criteria met
					Principal, Lanier-james Education Center 2011 -2012. Did not receive a school rating. Principal, Lanier-James Education Center 2010 - 2011. School rating 2010 -2011, Declining. Reading Mastery 17%, math mastery 15%, AYP criteria met 90%. Principal, Lanier-James Education Center 2009 - 2010. School Rating 2009-2010,

Principal	Kelvin Lee	BA - Physical Education, Illinois College; MA – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern University	6	21	Declining. Reading Mastery 20%, Math mastery 25%, AYP criteria met 97%. Principal of Lanier-James Education Center 2008-09, Rating: Declining Reading Mastery: 14% Math Mastery: 15% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: AYP: 90% criteria met. Economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading or math. Principal of Lanier-James Education Center 2007-2008 Rating: Incomplete Reading Mastery: 33% Math Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 77% Science Mastery: AYP: 49% criteria met. Black and economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading or math.
-----------	------------	--	---	----	--

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Synithia Crawford	M.S. Curriculum and Instruction B.S. Elem. Ed. Elementary Cert.	9	9	Currently awaiting the 2011-2012 school-wide data. 4th grade increased in reading by 10%, 7th grade by 72%, and 8th grade 67%. However, there was a decrease in reading in 5th grade by 14%, 6th grade 12%, 9th grade 27%, and 10th grade 95%. Economically Disadvantaged and Total AYP subgroup did not meet AYP. Assisted in the improvement of students who scored level 3, ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged AYP subgroups for 2010-2011. Assisted in increasing the 7th grade Reading scores by 6% and the 9th grade Reading scores by 38% for the 2009-2010. Assisted in increasing 2009-2010 Writing scores in 8th grade by 29% and 17% in 10th grade. Assisted in increasing 08-09 Reading FCAT scores in 8th grade by 14% and 10th grade by 15%. Assisted in maintaining our 08-09 Writing FCAT scores in the 70th percentile. 2008-09 Economically Disadvantaged subgroup or did not meet AYP in Reading or Math 2007-08 Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not meet AYP Assisted in maintaining 77% percent writing score school-wide 14% decrease of Black AYP subgroup of reading below grade level from 2007 to 2008 13% decrease of Economically Disadvantaged AYP subgroup reading below grade level from 2007 to 2008

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. Content Collaboration which entails content area teachers to have the same planning period to develop lessons, projects, etc.	Administration	06/13	
2	2. Classroom Observations and Feedback to all teachers which will allow them the necessary information to develop their careers	Administration	06/13	

3	3. Professional Learning Community (PLC) with different areas of focus	Administration and Curriculum Coach	06/13
---	--	-------------------------------------	-------

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
21	4.8%(1)	0.0%(0)	85.7%(18)	9.5%(2)	28.6%(6)	100.0%(21)	23.8%(5)	0.0%(0)	66.7%(14)

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
Kerry Cooper-Alexis, currently a Behavior Specialist who is a seasoned Math teacher with extensive knowledge in the content, technology, and data.	Chris Montenero	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Kedler Pouca, Behavior Specialist, certified Ed. Leadership, experienced in mathematics, science, and social studies.	Erica Madison	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Kedler Pouca	Francois Savain	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Pauline Hughes Veteran Language Arts teacher in an alternative education setting.	Natalia Garceau	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Brown Abraham	Thomas Jenkins	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
			Bi-Weekly meetings to

Synithia Crawford, a reading endorsed coach with great coaching and training experience in the Reading content area	Stephanie McBean	Content Collaboration	discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Kelvin Lee	Robert Leaf	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Kelvin Lee	Johnny Jones	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Synithia Crawford	Debra Kash	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Brown Abraham	Ronney Virgillito	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback
Reba Clarke, an ESE Specialist which is also Reading Endorsed and has experience as a Reading teacher.	Laura Gruber	Content Collaboration	Bi-Weekly meetings to discuss content, instruction, and classroom management Data Analysis discussions Observations and Feedback

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

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Kelvin Lee
 School Psychologist: Daniel Llinas
 Social Worker: Joycelyn Baskerville
 Assistant Principal: Brown Abraham
 ESE Specialist: Reba Clarke
 Behavioral Specialist: Kerry Cooper-Alexis
 Behavioral Specialist: Kedler Pouca
 Guidance Counselors: Temica Williams and Mbanefo Eruchalu
 Reading Coach: Synithia Crawford
 Intermediate Elementary Teacher: Kim Anderson
 Intermediate Teacher: Laura Gruber and Erica Madison

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?

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
 Assistant Principal: Assist principal with above outlined duties.

ESE Specialist: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Guidance Counselors: Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students.

School Psychologist: Interpret and/or recognize behavioral, mental, and emotional concerns involving our students.

The Social Worker and Behavior Specialist coordinate the team to meet once a week to engage in the following activities:
 Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and

classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. All cases are kept up to date on an Excel spreadsheet and the information regarding behavioral tier information is stored on a File Maker Pro database.

Reading Coach and Math Coach: Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They also identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. They provide guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitate and support data collection activities; assist in data analysis; provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

General Ed. Teachers: (Primary and Intermediate): Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The following individuals are mentors for at least 8-10 students in the school, therefore, that person will be the case manager for that particular student:

Brown Abraham, Reba Clarke, Kerry Cooper, Kedler Pouca, Temica Williams, Synithia Crawford, Joycelyn Baskerville, and Mbanefo Eruchalu.

Each mentor maintains a file on their students which includes their academic and behavioral history.

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

The RTI Leadership Team will assist the School Advisory Council with the development of the SIP by identifying areas of weakness and strengths and areas of intervention, mastery, and enrichment for students school wide. The RTI team will identify Tier 1 data and routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science, and behavior. The data will be used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and a school-wide approach to behavior management. This data will also be used as a means of screening to help identify students who are struggling with either academics and/or behavior or who may be in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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.

Academically, for all content areas, multiple sources are used to identify the various Tier levels. Virtual Counselor is utilized to identify all Tier 1-3 students across the content area. As students are identified that require additional support and intervention, such as level 1 and 2 students, they participate in added testing, which will primarily be FAIR testing beginning 2012-2013 school years, to determine specific areas of weakness. That data is also placed in Virtual Counselor. All level 1 and 2 students are provided additional pull-out assistance in reading and math. All students participate in year long progress monitoring 3 times a year. Behaviorally, the RTI team utilizes the point system that is maintained in a File Maker Pro database as well as a Positive Daily Behavior Sheet.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided by the Reading Coach during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Two PD sessions entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will take place in mid-September and in October. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration as well as identified individuals from the RTI team will monitor the process monthly to ensure the process is continuously effective and efficient. The process will be determined based on success rate of successful interventions and

amount of students reported for re-evaluation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal: Kelvin Lee
Assistant Principal: Brown Abraham
Reading Coach: Synithia Crawford
ESE Specialist: Reba Clarke
Guidance Counselors: Temica Williams and Mbanefu Eruchalu
Teachers: Pauline Hughes, Erica Madison, Johnny Jones, Laura Gruber, Kim Anderson (Each teacher is a secondary representative from each content area as well as an elementary teacher)
We currently do not have a media specialist.

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

The team meets twice a month to engage in the following activities:
Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT will be to increase literacy among our K-12 students that are struggling as well improve literacy ability among those students functioning at or above grade level. The LLT will focus on the following: developing model/demonstration classrooms, using data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesigning instruction and resources to meet student learning and intervention needs, monitoring and supporting the implementation of the Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs and scientifically based reading instruction and strategies with fidelity, leading and supporting Professional Learning Communities.

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.

Being a K-12 education center all teachers are encouraged to enroll in classes and/or workshops that provide him/her with the ability to facilitate reading strategies within their designated content areas. Content area teachers are encouraged to participate in FOR-PD or CAR- PD workshops to establish a background of reading strategies. The FOR-PD or CAR-PD training schedules will be provided to teachers. Teachers will be encouraged bi-weekly to complete the necessary training by their Content Collaboration mentors.

*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?

Although we are a K-12 disciplinary center, the school's mission is to provide all students with courses that will assist them in becoming productive citizens in society. Our high school students take Integrated Science which has been developed by the district. Other than Integrated Science we do not offer any other integrated courses. Unfortunately, we do not offer any career preparation or employability skills programs.

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?

Lanier-James Education Center provides all enrolled students in grades 6-12 with multiple guidance workshops that focus on career planning through ePEP as well as graduation requirements, and test preparedness. Our high school students are afforded the ability to participate in e2020 and Florida Virtual, an online learning program, which allows students to take advanced subject area courses. We utilize course progression charts to encourage students into rigorous courses and we ensure sequential progress toward program completion. Our guidance department offers Choices Planner and FACTS.org, which targets career preparation. An annual Career Day is implemented along with employment workshops, which was implemented for the first time this year. The employment workshops targeted the following areas: etiquette, work ethics, professionalism, and professional attire.

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](#)

The High School Feedback Report indicated that Lanier-James Education Center does not have adequate data to complete the report. However, we do obtain waivers for our eligible students to take the ACT and SAT. We do not have a BRACE advisor but our guidance director ensures our high school students are well prepared. We also offer the CPT for our students and the PSAT for our 10th graders. The guidance director and reading coach collaborate together to determine the best courses for our students based on the course progressions charts. Our guidance director also implements the AGP based on our schools needs. We also provide assistance for students wanting to transition to a GED option. Through our mentoring groups that all students participate in, individual career counseling is discussed and plans are developed. An annual Career Day is implemented along with employment workshops, which was implemented for the first time this year. The employment workshops targeted the following areas: etiquette, work ethics, professionalism, and professional attire.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 22% of students will score level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%(8)	22%

Problem-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	Disfluent students	Students in grades K-12 who scored level 1 and 2 on the 2011 FCAT will receive intensive pull-out instruction 1-2 times a week from qualified support staff and instructional coaches on areas of weakness.	Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal	Observations by coaches and administration, and teacher/administrator data chats. Data collected will determine the direction of staff development and school trends that may or may not need to be addressed.	Mini BAT assessments and district BAT
2	Student Placement	The school will implement FAIR to monitor student progress	Reading Coach	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	Print out and review of FAIR assessments.
3	Next Generation Sunshine State and Common Core Standards	Develop an Instructional Focus for Reading and Language Arts classes.	Reading Coach, Language Arts chair	Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation walkthroughs	Mini BAT 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
--	-----

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

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	Curriculum Enrichment	Students will receive enriched curriculum through classroom and technology	Teachers, Reading Coach	Speak with teachers and students on likability of program, data chats, and progress through levels	Review student records and technology reports

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 100% of level 4 and 5 students will maintain or increase a level on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10.6%(5)	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Curriculum Enrichment	Students will receive enriched curriculum through classroom and technology	Teachers, Reading Coach	Speak with teachers and students on likability of program, data chats, and progress through levels Review student records and technology reports	Review student records and technology reports
2	Curriculum Enrichment	Students will receive enriched curriculum through classroom and technology	Teachers, Reading Coach	Speak with teachers and students on likability of program, data chats, and progress through levels	Review student records and technology reports

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 48% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42.9% (23) of students	48% of students

Problem-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	Struggling Students	Social Studies/Science teachers will explicitly infuse reading strategies in lesson plans and instructional delivery. Reading strategies are provided weekly to all content area teachers from the Glossary of Reading Strategies as well as other reading resources.	Principal, Reading Coach, Social Studies and Science	When visiting Social Studies and Science classrooms, administrators and coaches will focus their attention to the frequency of explicitly teaching to the reading benchmarks in those content areas.	FCAT score, FAIR, and Mini BAT assessments will be disaggregated by social studies and science teachers
2	Academic Awareness	Student/teacher achievement chats will be conducted with all students following FAIR assessments.	Principal and Reading Coach	Review log for student achievement chats during walkthroughs	Administrators will randomly ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if data chats are successful.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, 19% of the lowest 25% of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (10)	19%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Disfluent Level 1 and 2	Students in grades K-12 who scored level 1 and 2 on the 2011 FCAT will receive intensive pull-out instruction 1-2 times a week from qualified support staff and instructional coaches on areas of weakness.	Principal, Reading coach	CWT by coaches and administration will be used to identify trends amongst the school. Teacher/Administrator data chats will determine if students are improving.	Mini BAT and District BAT

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 : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, all identified subgroups will increase a minimum of 5 percentage points on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 11% (8), Hispanic 13% (9), White 11% (8)	Black 16%, Hispanic 18%, White 16%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic deficiency	The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress	Reading Coach	Review FAIR data to ensure teachers are assessing students on an	Printout and review of FAIR assessments

				ongoing basis	
2	Various learning styles	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction for all of their students to address various learning needs and styles	Reading Coach, Administrator	Lesson Plans and lesson observations	Classroom Walkthroughs

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2013, 15% of the students in the ELL subgroup will demonstrate proficiency in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	15%

Problem-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	Language	Identified ELL students that require ELL services will be regularly monitored by the ESOL coordinator as well as content area teachers	ESOL Coordinator, Reading Coach, Reading teachers	Review student academic and data folders	Randomly talk with students about their progress and review assessment data

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students with Disabilities subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by a minimum of 5% on the 2013 Reading FCAT2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (13)	76%

Problem-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	Various Disabilities	Identified students that require ESE support services will be regularly monitored by the ESE specialist, supporting facilitators, as well as content area teachers	ESE Specialist Reading Coach, Reading teachers	Review student academic and data folders	Randomly talk with the students about their progress and review assessment data

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making	
--	--

satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:		By June 2013, 78% of the students in the Economically Disadvantaged AYP subgroup will demonstrate proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
73% (27)		78%			
Problem-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	Economic Hardship	Mentors will meet weekly with their students to review academic achievement and provide encouragement	RTI Team	Data Chats among content area teachers to discuss student progress	Review Mini BAT data through Virtual Counselor

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
Effective Implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar	Grades k-10	Reading Coach	Staff	Beginning September 2012 through May 2013 weekly meetings	Lesson Plans and Classroom Visits	Principal and Reading Coach
Professional Reading Strategies	Grades k-10	Reading Coach	Staff, PLC	Beginning September 2012 through May 2013 weekly meetings	Reading Coach's weekly log. Classroom Walk Throughs.	Principal and Reading Coach
Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum PLC	Grades k-10	Reading Coach	Instructional Staff	September 2012 - May 2013 (monthly meetings)	Focused walkthroughs with principal and reading coach to observe the frequency and effectiveness of activity	Principal and Reading Coach

Reading 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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal # 2:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By June 2013, 30% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (1)	30%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher familiarity with the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, as well as infusing the Common Core Standards.	Teachers will receive training on The Next Generation Sunshine State Standards(NGSSS) and Common Core Standards. Common planning will be utilized to effectively use all resources available.	Math Coach and Administration.	Lesson plans, teacher/instructional coach data chats, teachers will be required to specify instructional tools and goals based on the NGSSS, which will in turn determine if students achieved mastery.	BAT, mini assessments, lesson plans to include NGSSS, and teacher developed assessments aligned with the NGSSS.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	By June 2013, 100% of students identified as level 4 and higher will maintain or increase a level on the 2013
--	---

Mathematics Goal #2a:	Mathematics FCAT 2.0 assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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	Inadequate exposure of advance material.	Differentiate Instruction and the use of technology to provide enrichment. Utilize the enrichment activities in the GO Math series. Teachers will utilize the item specs as a guide to effectively teach the benchmarks in utilizing more higher cognitive complexity problems. Implementing project based learning and critical thinking activities to provide a more rigorous curriculum.	Administration and Math Coach.	Classroom walkthroughs/visits and informal observations will be conducted to monitor student progress and strategies being utilized.	BAT, mini assessments, Teacher made assessments, and 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 group:

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 30% of students will demonstrate learning gains in Mathematics on the FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

25% (1)		30%			
Problem-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 of background knowledge, skills, and strategies.	Differentiated instruction, Pull-outs and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies.	Administration and Math Coach	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized, monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data.	BAT, mini assessments, and teacher developed tests.

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 55 % of students identified in the lowest 25% will demonstrate a gain on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2)	55%

Problem-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 of background knowledge, skills, and strategies.	Differentiated instruction, as well as pull-outs and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Math Coach	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized, monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data.	BAT, mini assessments, teacher developed tests, and FCAT 2.0.
---	--	---	---	--	---

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal #				
		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the identified subgroups who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 50% (1) Hispanic 50% (1)	White 45% Hispanic 45%

Problem-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	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach	Review of Lesson Plans and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed tests.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA			NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary/language Barrier.	Effective use of manipulatives and hand-on activities. Graphic Organizers, the use of technology, small group instruction.	Math Coach and Administration	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, observations, review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, Teacher made 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Student with Disabilities subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1)	45%

Problem-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	Learning Environment	/Utilize IEP documentation to ensure students' needs are being met in the classroom. Utilize the access points effectively according to the needs of the students.	Principal, ESE Specialist, ESE Support facilitator, Assistant Principal, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher made assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1)	28%

Problem-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	Parents inability to assist at home due to various factors.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Pull-outs, push-ins by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional assistance. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Coach	Analyze student assessments and monitor student progress.	Mini assessments and teacher developed assessments.
---	---	---	--	---	---

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 18% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (7)	18%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher familiarity with the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, as well as infusing the Common Core Standards.	Teachers will receive training on The Next Generation Sunshine State Standards(NGSSS) and Common Core Standards. Common planning will be utilized to effectively use all resources available.	Math Coach and Administration	Lesson plans, teacher/instructional coach data chats, teachers will be required to specify instructional tools and goals based on the NGSSS, which will in turn determine if students achieved mastery.	BAT, mini assessments, lesson plans to include NGSSS, and teacher developed assessments aligned with the NGSSS.
2	Students lack of background knowledge, skills, and strategies	Differentiated instruction, Pull-outs and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies. Strategic Interventions will be utilized.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Coach	Maintain a record of all utilized strategies and interventions. Monitor students' progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Schedule ongoing team reviews and analysis of assessment data, pre and post tests.	BAT, mini assessments, and teacher developed tests.

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:		By June 2013, 10% of students who are level 4 or higher will maintain or show an increase of level on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
4% (2)		10%		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited course offerings excluding advance courses.	Differentiate Instruction and the use of technology to provide enrichment. Teacher will utilize the item specs as a guide to effectively teach the benchmarks in utilizing more higher cognitive complexity problems.	Administrator and Math Coach.	Classroom walkthroughs/visits, monitor student assessments	BAT, mini assessments, teacher developed assessments and 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 group:

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 38 % of students will demonstrate learning gains in mathematics on the FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (2)	38%

Problem-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 of background knowledge, skills, and strategies.	Differentiated instruction, Pull-outs and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies. Strategic Interventions will be utilized.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Coach.	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized, monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data, pre and post tests.	BAT, mini assessments, and teacher developed tests.
2	Students lack of motivation and Teachers lack of knowledge to motivate reluctant students.	Teachers will share best practices through collaborative planning on motivating students. Teacher/student data chats to inform students of their progress. Students will participate in school wide incentive programs. Monitoring student attendance. Teachers will differentiate instruction, use physical and virtual manipulatives, small group, technology and the internet to include FCAT Explorer and FOCUS to help engage students, and motivate students by making a connection between math and real world application.	Administration, Math Coach, and Counselors.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, review lesson plans, and student portfolios.	TERMS, Teacher developed assessments, BAT, mini assessments, and 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 group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 38% of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains in Mathematics on the FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (2)	38%

Problem-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 of background knowledge, skills, and strategies.	Differentiated instruction, Pull-outs and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies. Strategic Interventions will be utilized.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Math Coach.	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized, monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data, pre and post tests.	BAT, mini assessments, and teacher developed tests.
2	Students lack of motivation and Teachers lack of knowledge to motivate reluctant students.	Teachers will share best practices through collaborative planning on motivating students. Teacher/student data chats to inform students of their progress. Students will participate in school wide incentive programs. Monitoring student attendance. Teachers will differentiate instruction, use physical and virtual manipulatives, small group, technology and the internet to include	Administration, Math coach, and Counselors.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, review lesson plans, and student portfolios.	TERMS, Teacher developed assessments, BAT, mini assessments, and FCAT 2.0.

	FCAT Explorer and FOCUS to help engage students, and motivate students by making a connection between math and real world application.	
--	--	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>
--	---

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the identified subgroups who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will demonstrate a decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
---	---

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

White 78% (7) Black 85% (28) Hispanic 89% (8)	White 73% Black 80% Hispanic 84%
---	--

Problem-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	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.
2	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, and teacher developed assessments.

	matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.		
--	--	--	--

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the English Language Learners subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will demonstrate a decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	95%

Problem-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	Vocabulary/Language Barrier.	Effective use of manipulatives and hands-on activities. Graphic Organizers, the use of technology, and small group instruction. Effectively Implementing ESOL strategies. The ESOL coordinator monitor ESOL students.	Administration, ESOL Coordinator, and Math Coach.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, observations, and monitor student progress.	BAT, Mini assessments, Teacher developed assessments, and 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Students with Disabilities subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (17)	85%

Problem-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	Learning Environment	Utilize IEP documentation to ensure students' needs are being met in the classroom. Utilize the access points effectively according to the needs of the students.	Administration, ESE Specialist, ESE Support facilitator, and Math Coach.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits and review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, and teacher developed assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:		By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
84% (37)		79%			
Problem-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	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and FCAT 2.0.
2	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
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. Mathematics Goal #2:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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:

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June 2013, 29% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (4)	29%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher familiarity with the standards and benchmarks of the EOC	Teachers will receive training on standards and benchmarks. Common planning will be utilized to effectively use all resources available.	Math Coach and Administration	Review Lesson plans. Teacher/Instructional coach data chats. Teachers will be required to specify instructional tools and goals based on the standards and benchmarks, which will in turn determine if students achieved mastery.	BAT, mini assessments, lesson plans, teacher developed assessments aligned with the EOC, and EOC Exam.
2	Lack of prerequisite knowledge and skills.	Pre and post tests will be utilized. Comprehensive remediation. Students will participate in computer assisted instruction and practice. Differentiated instruction, pull-outs, and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies. Peer tutoring will also be utilized.	Math Coach and Administration	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized. Monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data and pretest.	BAT, mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, post-tests, District midterm, and 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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By June 2013, 10% of students will demonstrate scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in the Algebra 1 EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Limited course offerings	Differentiate Instruction	Administrator and	Classroom	BAT, mini

1	excluding advance courses.	and the use of technology to provide enrichment. Teachers will utilize the item specs as a guide to effectively teach the benchmarks in utilizing more higher cognitive complexity problems.	Math Coach	walkthroughs/visits and monitoring student data.	assessments, teacher developed assessments, and 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%.		Algebra Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the identified in the subgroups who are not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will decrease by a minimum 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Algebra 1 EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 60% (3) Black 75% (6) Hispanic 100% (0)	White 55% Black 70% Hispanic 95%

Problem-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	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.
2	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and EOC exam.

		using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.		
--	--	--	--	--

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
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	Vocabulary/Language Barrier.	Effective use of manipulatives and hand-on activities. Graphic Organizers, the use of technology, and small group instruction. Effectively Implementing the ESOL strategies.	Math Coach and Administration.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, observations, and review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, Teacher made assessments, and 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 subgroup:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Algebra 1 EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2)	95%

Problem-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	Learning Environment.	Utilize IEP documentation to ensure students' needs are being met in the classroom. Utilize the access points effectively according to the needs of the students.	Administration, ESE Specialist, ESE Support facilitator, and Math Coach.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits and review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, and teacher developed 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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:		By June 2013, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Algebra 1 EOC Exam.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
80% (12)		75%			
Problem-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	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and EOC exam.
2	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By June 2013, 10% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2013 Geometry End of Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% (0)			10%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher familiarity with the Standards and Benchmarks of the EOC.	Teachers will receive training on Standards and benchmarks. Common planning will be utilized to effectively use all resources available.	Math Coach and Administration.	Review Lesson plans. Teacher/Instructional coach data chats. Teachers will be required to specify instructional tools and goals based on the standards and benchmarks, which will in turn determine if students achieved mastery.	BAT, mini assessments, lesson plans, teacher developed assessments aligned with the EOC. EOC Exam.
2	Lack of prerequisite knowledge and skills.	Pre and post tests will be utilized. Comprehensive remediation. Students will participate in computer assisted instruction and practice. Differentiated instruction, pull-outs, and push-ins to remediate and reinforce necessary skills and strategies. Peer tutoring will also be utilized.	Math Coach and Administration.	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized. Monitor student progress. Maintain a log of all students receiving pull-outs and additional services. Ongoing review of assessment data and pretest.	BAT, mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, post-tests, District midterm, and 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. Geometry Goal #2:	By June 2013, 10% of students will demonstrate scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in the Geometry EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited course offerings excluding advance courses.	Differentiate Instruction and the use of technology to provide enrichment. Teachers will utilize the item specs as a guide to effectively teach the benchmarks in utilizing more higher cognitive complexity problems.	Administrator and Math Coach.	Classroom walkthroughs/visits and monitoring student data.	BAT, mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and 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 # 3A : <input type="text"/>			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal # 3B:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the identified subgroups who are not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Geometry EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 100% (1) Black 100% (2)	White 95% Black 95%

Problem-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	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.
2	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and 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 subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary/Language Barrier.	Effective use of manipulatives and hand-on activities. Graphic Organizers, the use of technology, and small group instruction. Effectively Implementing the ESOL strategies.	Math Coach and Administration.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits, observations, and review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, Teacher made assessments, and 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 subgroup:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Student with Disabilities subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Geometry EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	95%

Problem-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	Learning Environment.	Utilize IEP documentation to ensure students' needs are being met in the classroom. Utilize the access points effectively according to the needs of the students.	Administration, ESE Specialist, ESE Support facilitator, and Math Coach.	Classroom Walkthroughs/visits and review of lesson plans.	BAT, Mini assessments, and teacher developed 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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	By June 2013, the percentage of students identified in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup who are not making satisfactory progress in Geometry will decrease by a minimum of 5% for students not making satisfactory progress on the Geometry EOC Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

100% (2)		95%			
Problem-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	Math deficiencies in students that cannot be fully addressed during the allotted class time.	Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core instruction are pulled by either the math coach, classroom resource teacher or other support staff for additional tutoring beyond the allotted math class time. In addition, supplemental instruction using problem-solving process and Interventions will be matched to individual student needs to remediate and reteach the deficiencies.	Administration and Math Coach.	Monitor student progress and make revisions as needed.	BAT, Mini assessments, teacher developed assessments, and EOC exam.
2	Various Learning styles.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction, computer assisted instruction and practice, manipulatives, incorporate multiple strategies to target various learning styles in ensuring content mastery. Teachers would attend school training through professional development to address these needs.	Administration and Math Coach.	Review of Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs/visits, and observations.	BAT, Mini assessments, and Teacher developed assessments.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Textbook/Supplement Resource Training	Grades k-12	Math Coach and District trainers	Instructional and Support Staff	August 2012 through May 2013 (monthly meetings)	Review of lesson plans and visits-observations	Math Coach, Assistant Principal, and Principal
Math Collaborative Planning Meetings- Best practices	Grades k-12	Math Teachers and Math Coach	k-12 Math Teachers	September 2012 through May 2013 (weekly meetings)	Classroom visits-observations, review of lesson plans	Math Coach, Assistant Principal, and Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		By June 2013, 11% of elementary and middle school students will score level on the 2013 FCAT Science			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
06% (1)		11%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of exposure to content and hands-on situations because of absences, prior experience, and real life situations.	Utilize hands on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5E model and science stations. Teach students about "Going Green" with real life experiences. Motivational experiences as well as current events in science will be infused	Principal and Assistant Principal	Observations	Science mini assessments, teacher made tests, BAT and FCAT

		into the curriculum.			
2	Lack of level 4 and 5 students on campus	Utilize enrichment so that level 4 and 5 students have a better understanding of content. Utilize level 4 and 5 students as student peers as well as teacher assistants.	Principal and Assistant Principal	Observations	Science mini assessments, FCAT, BAT and teacher created 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
--	---

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 10% of students will score level 4 or above in 2013 FCAT Science.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of level 4 and 5 students on campus.	Utilize enrichment so that level 4 and 5 students have a better understanding of content. Utilize level 4 and 5 students as student peers as well as teacher assistants.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science teachers	Observations	Science mini assessments, FCAT, BAT and teacher created 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: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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				

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
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 science. Science Goal #2:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		

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				

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	By June 2013, 22% of students will score a level 3 on the 2013 Biology FCAT assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (2)	22%

Problem-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 exposure to content and hands-on situations because of absences, prior experience, and real life situations.	Utilize hands on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5E model and science stations. Teach students about "Going Green" with real life experiences. Motivational experiences as well as current events in science will be infused into the curriculum.	Assistant Principal and Principal	Observations	mini BAT assessments, teacher made assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	By June 2013, 10% of students will score a level 4 or above on the 2013 Biology assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% (0)						10%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Lack of level 4 and 5 students on campus.	Utilize enrichment so that level 4 and 5 students have a better understanding of content. Utilize level 4 and 5 students as student peers as well as teacher assistants.	Science teachers, Assistant Principal, Principal	Observations	Science mini assessments, FCAT, BAT and teacher created assessments.	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Going Green PLC	k-12	Science Teachers	Instructional Staff	September 2012 through May 2013 (monthly)	Present information gained through website and instructional coaches and principal will observe lessons demonstrating knowledge in lessons	Assistant Principal and Principal

Science Budget:

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

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 11% of students will score level 4 and above on the 2013 FCAT Writing assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% 3.0 or above (2)	73%

Problem-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	Exposure in various writing styles	Students will participate in daily writing activities across the content; all writing will be dated and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for monitoring of growth.	Principal and Reading Coach	A school wide method of saving student work will be established. During class periods, students will place their writing notebooks on their desks for principal to review.	Quarterly school wide writing 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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				

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teaching the use of revision and editing strategies	4,8,10	Language Arts Chair	Instructional Staff	September 2012 through June 2013	Follow up with teachers to review discuss student progress through student writing portfolios. Review with teachers the student samples in various writing prompts administered throughout the year	Reading Coach and Language Arts Chair
Reading and Writing Across the Content PLC	K-10	Language Arts Chair and Reading Coach	Instructional Chair	September 2012- through June 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs and writing folders and/or journals	Language Arts Chair and Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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				

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
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. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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				

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

Attendance Goal # 1:	By June 2013, the daily attendance rate will increase by a minimum of 2 percentage points from last school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
74.5%	78%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
56	50
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
14	10

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Involvement	Individualized monitoring of habitual absentee students. Utilize Parent Link to keep parents informed of student attendance.	School Social Worker, Principal, Assistant Principal	Attendance bulletin	Data Warehouse
2	Students are already suspended prior to them enrolling at our school	Work with area offices to have suspensions fulfilled prior to them enrolling at our school.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Attendance report from TERMS	Staffing reports
3	Students with habitual tardies and absences	Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) will meet accordingly to develop attendance plans for students with identified attendance concerns.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Attendance bulletin	Data Warehouse

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
Parental Involvement	Individualized monitoring of habitual absentee students. Utilize Parent Link to keep parents informed of student attendance.	School Social Worker, Principal, Assistant Principal	Staff	August 2012 through May 2013	Attendance bulletin	Principal and Assistant Principal

Parent Knight PLC	k-12	Social Worker, SAC Chair	SAC members, faculty and staff	October 2012 through May 2013 (monthly meetings)	Volunteer report and Parent attendance at functions	Social Worker and SAC chair
-------------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--	---	-----------------------------

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	By June 2013, internal and external suspensions will decrease by a minimum of 10 percent.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
299	269
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
96	86
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
96	86
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

57	50				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low parental/guardian support and involvement	Teachers and support staff will keep parents/guardians fully informed often of their child's behavior in an effort to reduce negative behavior. Involve parents/guardians in the decision making of interventions that are implemented and the progress of their child.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Behavior Specialists, Social Worker	Monitor parent contact logs from all teacher/support staff. Monitor referrals submitted and Internal Suspension log.	Terms, Discipline Management System, School Behavior Form, School-wide database for student points, RTI, and Parent contact logs.
2	Staff implementing Student Behavior Plans effectively.	Faculty and staff will participate in professional development in understanding the different components of the Student Behavior Plans and how to implement the various behavior strategies listed within the Plan. The Discipline committee will meet monthly to address the unique needs of our student population and refer students to the Response To Intervention Team that are not progressing.	Assistant Principal, Behavior Specialist, ESE Specialist	Monitor Staff development logs. Conduct student observations. Classroom walkthroughs/visits. Monitor referrals submitted to administration.	Terms, Discipline Management System, School Behavior Form, School-wide database for student points, RTI, Observations, and Staff Development attendance sheets.
3	Students adhering to the school discipline plan.	Students will participate in group and individual counseling to provide students with the knowledge of handling anger, as well as how to diffuse various situations. Students will be assigned mentors and mentors will monitor their students' progress. Incentives will be provided for students transitioning levels within our school wide Behavior Point System. Students that are not advancing will be referred to the Response To Intervention Team.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Behavior Specialists, Social Worker	Monitor and review all pertinent data regarding behavior. Monitor counseling logs. Student Mentors will review Behavior Point Sheets. Classroom walkthroughs/visits.	Terms, Discipline Management System, School Behavior Form, School-wide database for student points, RTI, and Counseling Notes.

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
Positive Behavior Interventions.	Grades k-12	ESE Specialist, Assistant Principal, Behavior Specialists	School-wide	Twice a month	Student observations and classroom walkthroughs/visits to ensure effective implementation of strategies.	Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	By June 2013, the graduation rate for Lanier-James will increase by 2 percent.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
District data (2%)	(1%)

2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
District data (69%)	(71%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are assigned to Lanier-James for a maximum of one year.	Provide all high school students with counseling sessions in reference to graduation. Monitor the progress of students at the point of entry into Lanier-James and set an action plan in place to move towards graduation requirements. Place all students who are behind with credits in APEX or virtual courses to make-up credits.	Principal, assistant principal, guidance counselors.	Pupil Progression Plan and conferences with parents and students.	High school graduation requirements being met.

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
Career Pathways	6-12	Social Worker, Reading Coach, Behavior Specialists	Support Staff	October 2012 through May 2013	Observations, Portfolios	Social Worker, Assistant Principal, Principal

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	By June 2013, parental involvement will increase by a minimum of 4 percentage points from last school year, therefore, improving students' behavioral and social skills.				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
4%(3)	8%				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parent Schedule	LJEC Parent Knights will be held quarterly involving parents of students in K-12.	SAC chair, Principal, Assistant principal	Sign-In sheets, survey	Database reports. Teacher feedback.
2	Lack of parent participation in student activities	Parent Chew and Chat, Knightly Child Care, Extra Points for students, Health Fair, and Parent conferences.	SAC Chair, Social Worker, Administration	Sign-In Sheets, In-House Parent Surveys	Database reports. Parental Survey Report. Teacher feedback.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Knight PLC	k-12	SAC Chair and Social Worker	SAC members, faculty, and staff	October 2012 through May 2013	Volunteer report and Parent attendance at functions	SAC Chair and Social Worker

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			By June 2013, 10% of all students will increase their participation in STEM activities.		
Problem-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	Although STEM increases student motivation and involvement in their own education, students still must pass standardized test in which reading is fundamental.	Integrate reading strategies into STEM curriculum.	Science teachers and Reading Coach	FAIR assessments and Reading FCAT 2.0	FAIR assessment reports and scores from Reading FCAT 2.0.

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 10/16/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC will meet monthly and as needed to monitor the school goals to be sure that the school is moving towards achieving the school's goals.

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