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

School Name: FLVS FULL TIME K-8

District Name: FL Virtual

Principal: Esilda Ross

SAC Chair: Shane May

Superintendent: Julie Young

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

# PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principal | Marcie Trombino | Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | 2 | 1 | |
| Principal | Sam Ashley | M.Ed Educational Leadership, Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | 1 | 1 | |
| Assis Principal | Angela Cox | Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | 2 | | |
| Assis Principal | Chantel White | Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | | | |
| Principal | Esilda Ross | Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | 5 | 3 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Shane May | Educational Leadership Certification (all levels) | | | |

## 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.

| | 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No data submitted | | | | | |

## 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 | Recruitment of Staff: Connections Academy is dedicated to the recruitment of quality employees. Positions are posted on a variety of websites to recruit a diverse, qualified candidate pool. Candidates move through several levels of interviewing in order to ensure the best candidate is selected. All staff undergoes a criminal background check and fingerprint and drug testing clearances. All teachers undergo a confirmation of the highly qualified status of their certification. | School level hiring managers and Human Resources Recruiters | | |
| 2 | Staff Development and Advancement: FLVS FT provides a range of opportunities for teachers to take on increasing responsibility and leadership roles. The Performance Evaluation System, School Improvement Plan, and a range of professional development opportunities ensure that the school's staff members are given opportunities for professional growth. Stakeholders, including parents, students, and staff, are encouraged to voice their thoughts about the school and how it may be improved, and to participate in the decision-making process. | School level managers, School Support Team, and school based trainers | | |
| 3 | Career Advancement Opportunities: In addition to the professional development opportunities available to all staff, Connections Academy offers three additional professional development programs, aimed at helping teachers and other staff advance to more responsible positions within Connections Academy. These three programs are the Career Ladder, the Manager Training series, and the Leadership Academy. | School administrators, Human Reources, School Support Team, and School Leadership Team. | | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 0 | NA |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | 0.0%(0) | 18.2%(20) | 65.5%(72) | 16.4%(18) | 50.0%(55) | 59.1%(65) | 29.1%(32) | 4.5%(5) | 50.9%(56) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sherry Detraz | Alisha Ruble | Both teachers are teaching PACE | Review one core standard each month, attend weekly Q & A sessions as needed, meet regularly to review training topics covered, support mentor with understanding Connexus, time management, hosting LiveLesson sessions, monitoring student progress, and assigning interventions. |
| Michelle Biggerstaff | Aurielle Hollinger-McKnight | Grade level match | See above |
| Harriet Zaret | Pauline Lilienfeld | Grade level match | See above |
| Christina Seamster | Christine Mejia | Grade level match | See above |
| Jaclyn Poe | Erin McMillan | Grade level Match | See above |
| Amy Williamson | Heidi Conley | Grade level match | See above |
| Lauren Plocica | Julie Kendrick | Grade level match | See above |
| Felicia Coletti-Ingold | Karen Wynn-Bell | Grade level match | See above |
| Sandi Sumerfield | Lisa Collum | Grade level match | See above |
| Patricia Mitchell | Maegan Hambor | Location | See above |
| Gabrielle Nieves | Mica Butler | Grade level match | See above |
| Lenora Wallace | Michele Pelfrey | Grade level match | See above |
| Jenna Pender | Mindy Moore | Grade level match | See above |
| April Greeson | Sherry Shropshire | Grade level match | See above |
| Dana Gill | Terri Freeman | Grade level match | See above |
| Sherry Detraz | Shelly Sawyer | Both teachers are teaching PACE | See above |
| Christina Seamster | Christina Stradley | Grade level match | See above |
| Gabrielle Nieves | Kalani Vargas | Grade level match | See above |
| Dana Gill | Kasey Verneer | Grade level match | See above |
| Rachelle Enrique-Sosa | Alison London | Content area match | See above |
| Shannon Lewis | Anjanette Richard-Jones | Content area match | See above |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kimberly Tegeler | Debra Scherer | Assignment match | See above |
| Leah Lerma | Jackie Lewis | Content area match | See above |
| Tara Ulrich | Jessica Pezzula | Assignment match | See above |
| Jeremiah Dow | Kim Day | Content area match | See above |
| Alanna Shaw | Lisa Richard | Content area match | See above |
| Amanda Blodgett | Lourdes Suarez | Content area match | See above |
| Jay Christman | Nicole Schaefer | Content area match | See above |
| Tyane Deal | Porscha McCloud | Content area match | See above |
| Brandie Taylor | Katherine Queen | Content area match | See above |
| Barbara Mulkey | Rebecca Huckertt | Content area match | See above |
| Tiffany Fillingham | Roslyn Wilson | Assignment match | See above |
| Melissa Vargas | Sarah Lugo | Content area match | See above |
| Rachel Quirello | Susan Skibicki | Content area match | See above |
| Lori Yates | Katherine Laaker | Middle School match | See above |

## 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

Coordination of programs and use of all funding sources (state, local and federal) appropriately is a joint responsibility of the school's principal and the management company's senior manager of federal programs and financial services team with which the school has contracted for these services. For example, the application and budget for each of the title programs is reviewed by all the above parties to ensure there is no duplication of funding items. Tracking of expenditures for every funding source (and collection of all needed documentation) is coordinated by the financial services team. FLVS FT does not use consolidated funding so each program is tracked separately.

FLVS FT employs a multi-tiered intervention model (RTI) so that all students have access to the curriculum and instructional resources they need to be successful. The school's Student Support Team (SST) meets on a weekly basis to discuss students who are struggling academically to develop an intervention plan and strategies for improvement, which may include use of Tier 2 – Supplemental Programs and Supports or Tier 3 – Supplemental Alternative Programs depending on the student's needs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

It is expected that 100% of the teachers will be highly qualified and this is accomplished during the hiring process when candidate screening includes review of the candidate's credentials and endorsements (such as for ELL learners) as required to ensure that the documentation confirms their highly qualified status. A review of the staff's HQ status is conducted annually. If a need exists that forces the hiring of a non HQ teacher, a plan is developed at the time of hire to support that person in becoming HQ as soon as possible. Typical assistance is tuition reimbursement for required classes.

Specific PD activities: *Entire K-8 instructional staff to attend FLVS staff conference, breakout sessions specific to virtual learning and each school.

*Solution Tree - Professional Learning Communities Leadership trainings - Administrative Staff

At FLVS FT, teacher professional development is considered critically important in ensuring that the staff is optimally effective in teaching in a virtual environment and addressing the Florida Standards in their daily instructional practice. FLVS FT uses the National Standards for Quality Online Teaching published by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL) as its guide for pinpoint necessary teacher skills and professional development requirements. FLVS FT will provide its teachers with a comprehensive teacher training and professional development program to equip them with the following:

• A working knowledge of the FLVS FT curriculum and standards

• Strategies and best practices for virtual learning and instruction

• How to utilize and navigate the tools of the Learning Management System (Connexus)

• How to develop Personalized Learning Plans

• Forms of assessment and how to utilize test results to guide instruction

• Knowledge of program processes and policies

• How to foster a virtual school community

FLVS FT teachers will participate in the following professional development activities designed to hone their understanding of the curriculum and accountability measures:

• The FLVS FT Interactive Program Manual: The FLVS FT Program Manual is a resource for teachers and school-based personnel to use all year. It contains policies, procedures and "how to" components that aid the teachers on a day-to-day basis. These "how to" components also have accompanying on-line tutorial segments that visually demonstrate each process.

• Initial Teacher Orientation Course: All teachers (and administrators) will complete a self guided teacher-training course developed specifically for FLVS FT . This course is delivered through the Connexus, and contains actual lessons, assessments, and links to online tutorials. The focus of this course is to prepare teachers for the first few weeks of school, and it covers "the basics" including curriculum, assessment, personalizing instruction, school year events, grading and report cards, communication, and essential Connexus tools. Upon successful completion of this course and assessments, teachers are ready to begin instruction. Teachers are expected to earn a grade of 90% or better.

• Pre-Service Face-to-Face Training: In addition to the self-guided course, FLVS FT staff will engage in several days of face-to-face training and orientation on site.

• Supplemental Teacher Training Course Segments: Once school is up and running, FLVS FT will present more segments of the training course to teachers on an ongoing basis. These segments contain information about more complex features and functions of the Connexus, instructional processes, and processes that teachers need to implement once school is successfully under way. There is also a differentiated course designed specifically for returning staff members that targets new concepts, advanced applications, and serves as a refresher on basic skills.

• Connections Academy Professional Development Sessions: Connections Academy provides teachers with ongoing professional development activities throughout the year. Presenters with various backgrounds and areas of content expertise conduct live tutorial sessions on a rotating basis throughout the school year. Teachers are required to virtually attend monthly sessions throughout the year including such topics as: implementing specific instructional strategies, current curriculum-specific topics and trends, effective teaching strategies and communication skills for a virtual environment, utilizing the state standards to guide instruction, educational technology, using data to guide instruction, educational trends, and so on.

• Connections Academy Graduate Course in Online Learning: Connections Academy has collaborated with Boise State University to create a series of graduate level courses in teaching in an online environment. FLVSFT teachers will be encouraged to take these courses as well as to pursue additional relevant post-graduate coursework.

• Professional Learning Community: Each Connections Academy teacher has access to a robust online Professional Learning Community portal in Connexus, which lists multiple professional development opportunities as well as message boards, recorded LiveLessons, shared resources, and more. Teachers describe this area as "a community created and dedicated to shared values and vision, working and learning collaboratively, shared decision making, collective creativity, and supportive and shared leadership. As a collegial group, we are united in our commitment to student learning through collaboration in our community."

• Weekly Teacher Updates: The Connections Academy School Support Staff compiles and sends out to all teachers a weekly electronic newsletter that highlights improvements to the curriculum and LMS, new procedures, shared tips, and community building activities. FLVS FT teachers will be surveyed regularly regarding their satisfaction with professional development experiences to help guide continuous improvement in this area. In addition, specific teacher accountability metrics help school administrators quantify impact of professional development activities and areas in need of additional work. The Connections Academy curriculum, instruction, and school support areas also conduct ongoing evaluations of professional development activities.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

NA

Other

US DOE named level of parental involvement as one of seven factors that affect at-risk students. Activities are designed to capitalize on types of parental involvement identified by Johns Hopkins University:
*Providing learning coach resource sessions on topics from reinforcing academic concepts to parenting and behavior management.
*Nature of online learning supports "learning at home", collaboration and sharing of ideas between parents and educators
*Communication with teachers is integral, this project also focuses teachers on how to communicate with parents to encourage involvement
*Face to face events encourage community involvement and parent volunteers
*School improvement planning involves parents in decision-making


Other relevant research used to support our initiatives:

A New Generation of Evidence: The Family Is Critical to Student Achievement, Anne T. Henderson and Nancy Berla (Henderson, A., & Berla, N. (Eds.). A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement. National Committee for

Citizens in Education, Center for Law and Education, Washington, DC, 1994) document concrete benefits of parent involvement for students, including higher grades and test scores, higher graduation rates, and greater enrollment in postsecondary education. A Stanford study found that using parents as tutors brought significant and immediate changes in children`s I.Q. scores. At FLVS FT, parents are closely involved in their child's education.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

FLVS FT uses the Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) method of developing and implementing research based instruction and interventions based on a three tiered model. The RtI model used by FLVS FT integrates core instruction (Tier 1), supplemental instruction/interventions (Tier 2), and intensive interventions (Tier 3). At each tier level, progress monitoring is implemented and reported to serve as written documentation of activities, meetings, and responsible personnel.

The Student Support Team (SST) is a general education, data driven, decision-making committee whose standing members consist of at least the principal/designee, a classroom teacher,parent/learning coach, and the referring teacher. Additionally, School Counselors, Master Teachers, Reading Coach, Special Education Teachers, and SLPs may be on the SST team if applicable. Contracted service personal including but not limited to School Psychologist, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapist, and Mental Health Counselor are invited to participate on the SST team if applicable to the specific student in review. The SST shall review and analyze all screening data, including intervention results at each tier, to determine the most beneficial option for the student.

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?

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 School Leadership Team will continue to work clsely with all stakeholders to ensure stakeholder grpoups are providing feedback that will be used in the creation and modification of the School Improvement Plan.

### 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.

1. Students in grades K-8 will take the LEAP pretest in both Reading and Math. The LEAP test results will be analyzed and students who score below grade level readiness will be referred to the Student Support Team (SST) for determination of need for Tier 2 intervention services.

2. The Student Support Team will gather assessment data and information provided from other relevant records for problem analysis to determine whether a student is in need of a PS/RtI Tier 2 plan. If deemed necessary, a performance goal is determined and evidenced-based intervention(s) will be developed to address the area(s) of concern. Students who meet benchmark standards will remain at Tier 1.

3. Tier 1 instruction includes weekly monitoring of academic performance and Live Lesson attendance, which is not mandatory for Tier 1 students. Additionally, in Tier 1, students receive a monthly Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) and/or Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) phone call to better monitor independent levels of academic performance. When conducting a CBM phone call, teachers use monitoring probes derived from DIBELS®, AIMsWeb®, and EasyCBM that provide normative data. Performance of Tier 1 students be reviewed at least once each semester.

4. Tier 2 of FLVSFT PS/RtI consists of supplemental instruction/interventions used in addition to Tier 1 Core instruction, and managed by the SST. With parent involvement, the SST meets to develop an intervention plan and obtain consent for screening, if necessary. Designated personnel will implement the intervention(s) and collect progress monitoring data to measure response and effectiveness.

Teachers monitor daily academic progress for students in Tier 2 and weekly Live Lesson attendance is mandatory. CBA/CBM phone calls are made at least twice per month, however, the progress monitoring schedule is dependent upon the needs of the student. If adequate progress is not being made, the SST makes a determination to modify the current intervention plan, or progress to a more intensive plan. Tier 2 supplemental programs include, but are not limited to: Reading Eggs (K-2), Headsprout® (K-3), Raz-Kids® (K-5), Math-Whizz® (3-8), SuccessMaker® (K-8), Math XL® (9-12), Skills Tutor (K-12), and

Study Island (3-8). During the SST Tier 2 meeting, the student's Learning Coach (LC) will be given an explanation and/or training tutorial of the specific intervention program selected by the team.

Students must work at least two hours per week in the supplemental program -in addition to core academic instruction and attendance requirement. Additionally, the LC will sign an acknowledgement form accepting primary responsibility for ensuring the student is logging in to the designated intervention program and completing assignments and activities, as well as ensuring the student is attending the teacher's weekly Live Lessons.

5. Tier 3 is comprised of intensive interventions in addition to the Core academic curriculum and supplemental program(s). Parents and SST meet and review progress monitoring data from Tier 1 and Tier 2. Targeted intensive interventions for academic concerns are developed and implemented. Progress monitoring occurs on a more frequent basis. Students, in Tier 3, have a mandatory biweekly Live Lesson attendance policy. Additionally, students in Tier 3 receive weekly CBA/CBM phone calls. Teachers monitor academic progress daily for students in Tier 3. If adequate progress is not being made, the team makes a decision whether to modify tier 3 intervention; ask for additional evaluations; or consider special education services. During the SST tier 3 meeting, the student's learning coach (LC) will be given an explanation and/or training tutorial of the specified intervention program the team decides upon. Additionally, the LC will sign an acknowledgement form acknowledging that the LC is primarily responsible for ensuring the student is logging into the designated intervention program at least 4 hours a week and completing designated assignments/activities as well as ensuring the student is attending the teacher's weekly Live Lessons.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Current proposed plan is to train through pre-recorded LiveLesson sessions and then meet in small breakout groups to answers questions/concerns regarding the information that was contained in pre-recorded LiveLesson. Administrators and master teachers will host face to face trainings with the assistance of the Special Education Team for the "hub" meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Christine Harris, Literacy Program Manager
Julie Durrance, Reading Resource/Intervention Specialist
Jennifer Jabo, FT Coach Grades K-5
Enid Rentas, Peer Lead / FT Coach Grades 6-8

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

Christine Harris, Literacy Program Manager oversees the Literacy Team and works closely with Esilda Ross, Lead Principal. Enid Rentas, Peer Lead / FT Coach Grades 6-8, Julie Durrance, Reading Resource/Intervention Specialist and Jennifer Jabo, FT Coach Grades K-5, work closely with Samuel Ashley, Middle School Principal, and Marcie Trombino, Elementary School Principal, to identify needs, plan and execute the Literacy Team Action Plan.

Frequent communications take place via scheduled meetings:

Data Discussions
Weekly meetings with Elementary teachers by grade clusters (K/1, 2/3 4/5)
Weekly meetings with Middle School teachers by content area

Team Meetings
Weekly meeting with Program Manager
Weekly Literacy Lead Team Meetings
Weekly FLVS FT K-8 Professional Development Meetings
FLVS FT Elementary School, Middle School, and K-8 Staff Meetings
FLVS FT Elementary School and Middle School Leadership Meetings

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

Goal: The Literacy Coaches / Team will implement new initiatives and immediate intensive instructional support in FLVS FT to: increase students performance in K-8 Reading & Writing for the 2012-2013 school year. This includes our lowest 25th percentile and all Reading within the content areas: Math and Science, to receive an "A" school grade.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

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

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

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

## *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?

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?

## 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

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | 74% (768) of students were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). Our target for this year is 80% high achieving. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3:<br>Grade 3 - 21.43% (24)<br>Grade 4 - 32.00% (40)<br>Grade 5 - 31.47% (44)<br>Grade 6 - 28.11% (61)<br>Grade 7 - 31.22% (73)<br>Grade 8 - 26.47% (53) | 80% of our students will be proficient in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, progress monitoring data and AOPR. | FAIR and LEAP |

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | 45% (470) of students scored Level 4 or higher on reading FCAT. Our target for this year is 50%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4<br>Grade 3 - 30.36% (34)<br>Grade 4 - 31.20% (39)<br>Grade 5 - 28.67% (41)<br>Grade 6 - 32.26% (69)<br>Grade 7 - 27.43% (64)<br>Grade 8 - 23.04% (47)<br><br>Level 5<br>Grade 3 - 12.50% (14)<br>Grade 4 - 12.80% (16)<br>Grade 5 - 22.38% (32)<br>Grade 6 - 19.82% (43)<br>Grade 7 - 18.57% (44)<br>Grade 8 - 13.24% (27) | 50% of our students will score Level 4 or above in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, progress monitoring data and AOPR. | |

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

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

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | Less than 74% of our students made annual growth as evidenced by learning gains. |
|---|---|
| Reading Goal #3a: | |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| Less than 74% | 80% of our students will make learning gains in Reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, progress monitoring data and AOPR. | |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | |
|---|---|
| Reading Goal #3b: | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 66% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. We have focused our hiring efforts on Reading Endorsed teachers to work in Intensive Reading courses. |
|---|---|
| Reading Goal #4: | |

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

Level 1 and Level 2:
Grade 3 - 35.72% (40)
Grade 4 - 24.00% (30)
Grade 5 - 17.48% (25)
Grade 6 - 19.81% (43)
Grade 7 - 22.79% (54)
Grade 8 - 37.25% (76)

70% of our bottom 25% of students will make learning gains in Reading.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Identifying Level 1 and Level 2 students who are new to our school so that they are appropriately placed in Intensive Reading. | We recently added SuccessMaker Reading as a Tier 3 intervention. Success Maker is a research-based instructional software program. Ongoing training is being provided for all Intensive Reading teachers. | Marcie Trombino and Samuel Ashley | Data from FAIR, monthly CBMs, and Skills for Success. | FAIR and LEAP |

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 # <br> NA <br><br> 5A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <br><br> Reading Goal #5B: | TBD |
|---|---|
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making

satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5C:

| | |
|---|---|
| | 22% of ELL students were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). Our target for this year is 25% high achieving. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| English Language Learners: L1- 49%,L3 - 18%, L4 & above- 4% | 25% of our ELL students will be proficient in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Identification of ELL students and ESOL Endorsed Tachers. | Recruit ESOL endorsed teachers, provide ESOL training for all returning staff through CaseNEX, and use targeted strategies with ELL students. | Sam Ashley | FAIR, Monthly CBMs, and LEAP | CELLA |

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: | TBD |
|---|---|

| 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 |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E: | 74% (768) of students were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). This subgroup's performance is lower than the school's overall achievement in reading. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| In 2012, 66% of grades 3-8 students who were economically disadvantaged were high achieving. | In 2013, 71% of grades 3-8 students who are economically disadvanted will be high achieving. |

| 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 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley | CBM data, progress monitoring data and AOPR. | |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FLVS Professional Learning Conference | K-12 | FLVS Professional Development | All staff | Annual | | Esilda Ross |
| Returning Teacher Orientation and Program Handbook | K-12 | Connections Academy School Support | All teachers and administrators | Annual | Passing score within first 30 days of school year. | Human Resources |
| Connections Academy Professional Development | K-12 | Connections Academy | All staff | Weekly | In-service | Managers |

## 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 |

# Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| | |

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

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | 51% (526) of students were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). Our target for this year is 55% high achieving. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3:<br>Grade 3 – 29.73% (33)<br>Grade 4 – 29.03% (36)<br>Grade 5 – 23.78% (34) | 55% of our students will be proficient in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | 21% (79) of students scored Level 4 or higher on math FCAT. Our target for this year is 25%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4<br>Grade 3 - 14.41% (16)<br>Grade 4 - 9.68% (12)<br>Grade 5 - 18.88% (27) | 25% of our students will score Level 4 or above in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Less than 50% of our students made annual growth as evidenced by learning gains. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| Less than 50% | 55% of our students will make learning gains in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction.Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | 45% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 1 and Level 2<br>Grade 3 - 53.16% (59)<br>Grade 4 - 54.84% (68)<br>Grade 5 - 48.28% (69) | 50% of our bottom 25% of students will make learning gains in math. |

| | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Identifying Level 1 and Level 2 students who are new to our school so that they are appropriately placed in PACE Math and/or Essential Math. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. We recently added SuccessMaker Math as a Tier 3 intervention. Success Maker is a research-based instructional software program. Ongoing training is being provided for teachers. | Marcie Trombino and Samuel Ashley | CBM data and AOPR. | |

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 # |
|---|---|
| | NA ▲<br><br>5A : ▼ |

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | TBD |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

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

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | TBD |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | TBD |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | Performance of this subgroup is lower than overall school performance in Math. 51% (526) of students overall were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 36% of grades 3-5 economically disadvantaged students were high achieving in math. | In 2013, 41% of grades 3-5 economically disadvantaged studens will be high achieving. |

Problem-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 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. Economically disadvantaged students make up approximately 47% of new enrollment. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | 51% (333) of students were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). Our target for this year is 55% high achieving. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3<br>Grade 6 - 35.19% (76)<br>Grade 7 - 29.61% (69)<br>Grade 8 - 29.90% (61) | 55% of our students will score proficient in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | 19% (127) of students scored Level 4 or higher on math FCAT. Our target for this year is 22%. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| Level 4<br>Grade 6 - 18.06% (39)<br>Grade 7 - 15.45% (36)<br>Grade 8 - 10.29% (21) | 22% of our students will score Level 4 or above in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | |
|---|---|

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

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | Less than 50% of our students made annual growth as evidenced by learning gains. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Less than 50% | 55% of our students will make learning gains in math |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. We are working through the challenge of receiving requested records and inputting student FCAT data for review. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Sam Ashley and Marcie Trombino | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | 46% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 1 and Level 2<br>Grade 6 - 42.60% (92)<br>Grade 7 - 48.50% (113)<br>Grade 8 - 56.37% (115) | 50% of our bottom 25% of students will make learning gains in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Identifying Level 1 and Level 2 students who are new to our school so that they are appropriately placed in PACE Math and/or Essential Math. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate.<br>We recently added SuccessMaker Math as a Tier 3 intervention. Success Maker is a research-based instructional software program. Ongoing training is being provided for teachers. | Marcie Trombino and Samuel Ashley | CBM data and AOPR. | |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | |
|---|---|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal #<br>NA<br><br>5A : |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | TBD |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| --- | --- |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

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

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | TBD |
| --- | --- |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| --- | --- |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

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

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | TBD |
| --- | --- |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| --- | --- |
| Data not available broken down by K-5 and 6-8. | TBD |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | Performance of this subgroup is lower than overall school performance in Math. 51% (526) of students overall were high achieving last year (level 3 proficiency or higher). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 40% of grades 6-8 economically disadvantaged students were high achieving in math. | In 2013, 45% of grades 6-8 economically disadvantaged studens will be high achieving. |

| Problem-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 | 71% of our testing population is new to the school this year and 38% enrolled after the first day of school. Economically disadvantaged students make up approximately 47% of new enrollment. | Compiling the data we have received and distributing to instructional staff by Nov 1 to guide instruction. Offering Help Sessions daily, encouraging students to attend peer tutoring sessions, and assigning supplemental instruction programs such as Math Whizz, Math XL, and SuccessMaker Math as appropriate. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley | CBM data, Skills for Success scores and AOPR. | LEAP Pre/Post Tests in Study Island and Skills Tutor Math |

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

# Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Algebra Goal #<br><br>3A : | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

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

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | |
|---|---|
| 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 subgroup:

| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

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

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

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal # 3A : | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Returning Teacher Orientation and Program Handbook | K-12 | Connections Academy School Support | All teachers and administrators | Annual | Passing score within first 30 days of school year. | Human Resources |

| FLVS Professional Learning Conference | K-12 | FLVS Professional Development | All Staff | Annual | | Esilda Ross |
| Connections Academy Professional Development | K-12 | Connections Academy | All Staff | Weekly | In-service | Managers |

---

Mathematics Budget:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:darkred;color:white">Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Available Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:darkred;color:white">Technology</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Available Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:darkred;color:white">Professional Development</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Available Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:darkred;color:white">Other</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strategy</td><td>Description of Resources</td><td>Funding Source</td><td>Available Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>No Data</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:darkred;color:white;text-align:right">Grand Total: $0.00</td></tr>
</table>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | 55% of students in both grades scored at level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0 Science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 36% of 5th graders and 37% of 8th graders scored level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Science. | 60% of students in both grades will score at level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0 Science. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | 71% new student population with 38% having enrolled late in the year, the challenge | Reorganization of units within science curriculum, creation of podcasts and | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley | Science classroom "walkthroughs" including during Livelessons and | Unit Assessments |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | for instructors will be to supplement curriculum and fill gaps in coverage of science benchmarks within curriculum. | Livelessons to supplement curriculum and serve as a timeline of benchmark practice for students who enrolled after the start of the school year. | | podcast observations | |

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.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| | |

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | 19% of students in both tested grade levels scored level 4 or above on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science. |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| 25% of students in 5th grade and 14% of students in 8th grade scored level 4 or above on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science. | 25% of students in both tested grade levels will score level 4 or above on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 71% new student population with 38% having enrolled late in the year, the challenge for instructors will be to supplement curriculum and fill gaps in coverage of science benchmarks within curriculum. | Reorganization of units within science curriculum, creation of podcasts and Livelessons to supplement curriculum and serve as a timeline of benchmark practice for students who enrolled after the start of the school year. Identification of students to participate in enriched science course and increased development of | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley | Classroom observation, Walkthrough | Unit Assessments, Skills Tutor and Study Island Science Reports |

| | | lab/experiment simulations. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 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.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | |

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

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

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Train 5th and 8th grade science teachers in strategies for identifying gaps in curriculum and reorganizing/supplementing units and lessons to ensure maximum exposure to FCAT tested benchmarks. | 5,8 Science | Science Master Teacher, Curriculum Specialist | 5th grade teachers, 8th grade science teachers | August 2012 - May 2013 | Classroom Walkthroughs/Observation, Pre/Post testing in Study Island and Skills Tutor Science | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley |
| Train 5th and 8th grade science teachers in | | | | | | |

| the use of technology for creating podcasts and Livelessons to differentiate instruction for science students. | 5,8 Science | Science Master Teacher, Curriculum Specialist/School Support | 5th grade teachers, 8th grade science teachers | October 2012-May 2013 | Livelesson Observation, Message Board Postings | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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 |

*End of Science Goals*

# Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. <br><br> Writing Goal #1a: | 75% of students in both tested grade levels scored at level 3.0 or higher in 2012. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 70% of 4th grade students and 79% of 8th grade students scored level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test. | 80% of students in both tested grade levels will score at or above level 3.0 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lack of fidelity in implementation of the writing program and | Utilize literacy coach and resource teachers to train all teachers, | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley Writing Committee | All teachers and administrators trained in using writing rubric and | Using rubric, monthly monitoring of |

| | | lack of comfort with program technology due to 48% new staff. | model lessons, monitor performance intervention planning and peer tutoring program, and develop consistent practice and assessment activities to be conducted with 4th and 8th graders. | Chair Literacy Coach | instructional techniques. Classroom walkthroughs. | progress toward students scoring 3 or above. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | | | | |

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Train grades 3-8 teachers in performance intervention planning for struggling writers. | 3-8 | Literacy Team, Writing Committee | 3-8 Teachers | August 2012-May 2013 | Individual Performance Intervention Plans with struggling students tracked through Issue Aware system. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley Literacy Coach |
| Train all K8 teachers in using the FCAT Writing Rubric to score esaays and short answer and integration of writing instruction into content area. | All | Literacy Team, Writing Committee | K-8 Teachers | August 2012-May 2013 | Monthly practice essay-scoring, question and answer with literacy team. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley Literacy Coach |
| Train 4th and | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8th grade teachers in facilitation of peer tutoring program, Writing Buddies. | 4,8 | Literacy Team, Writing Committee | 4th grade teachers, 8th grade Language Arts teachers | August 2012-May 2013 | Walkthroughs in Peer Tutoring Sessions, tracking scores of participants on monthly writing prompts. | Marcie Trombino Samuel Ashley Literacy 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.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

in need of improvement for the following group:

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Subtotal: | $0.00 |
| | | Grand Total: | $0.00 |

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| | |

| Problem-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 | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

# Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| | |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-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 |||||||

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)*

# 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:<br><br>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
|  |  |

| Problem-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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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** |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

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

| Problem-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

| ʝ Priority | ʝ Focus | ʝ Prevent | ʝ NA |
|-----------|---------|-----------|------|

Are you a reward school:  ʝ Yes  ʝ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

# 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.

 No. Disagree with the above statement.

## If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

SAC will be seated by January 2013 and will be the first SAC for this school. Every attempt will be made to recruit a majority of members who are not employed by the school district.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

To be formed January 2013.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found