FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: EDWARD H. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Christopher Jackson

SAC Chair: Rishawnda Tillman

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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	Christopher Jackson	Bachelors: Elementary Education Masters: Educational Leadership	1	11	Enterprise Learning Academy 2000 – 2001 (D) 2001- 2002 (A) Kernan Middle School 2003-2004 (B) Arlington Middle School 2004-2005 (C) Hickory Creek Elementary 2005-2006 (A) St. Augustine High School 2006-2007 (B) Lake Shore Middle School 2007-2008 (C) Andrew Jackson 2008 – 2009 (F) 2009 – 2010 (D) 2010 – 2011 (F) 2011 – 2012 (TBD)
		Bachelors: Masters: Master's Degree in Business Administration			

Assis Principal	Terry Boatman	from Nova Southeastern University Educational Leadership Certification Florida Professional Education Certificate in English (Grades 6 – 12), Educational Leadership (all levels), and Reading Endorsement.	2	5	Edward H. White High School 2011-2012: Grade TBD. West Jacksonville Elementary School 2010 – 2011 (F) 2009 – 2010 (C) Susie Tolbert Elementary 2008 – 2009 (B) 2007-2008 (C)
Assis Principal	Leonard Chaplinski	Bachelors: Secondary Education Masters: Education Administration	8	27	2011-2012: Grade TBD. Science Mastery at 42% 2010-2011: Grade D. Science Mastery at 32% 2009-2010: Grade D. Science Mastery at 42% 2008-2009: Grade D. Reading Mastery: 27%, Math Mastery: 61%, Writing Mastery: 73%, Science Mastery: 33%. AYP was not made in any subgroup.
Assis Principal	Timothy Durkin	Bachelors: Marine Science Masters: Education Leadership	1	1	2011-2012 – School Grade: TBD. Science Mastery at 63%. 2010-2011 – School Grade increased from an F to a D. Science Mastery at 15%.
Assis Principal	Elizabeth Jolliffe	Bachelors: English Masters: English	1	1	2011-2012—School scores increased a total of 122 points, with significant increases in Reading and student learning gains. 2010-2011—Writing scores increased by 19% students scoring proficient 2009-2010—College Readiness in Reading and Math increased a combined total of 38%.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Mathematics	Euconfra Corbit	Masters of Education, Secondary Math Bachelor of Arts, Mathematics	27	5	2011-2012: Grade TBD. Algebra 1 Mastery: 43%, Learning Gains: 57%, Lowest 25% Gains: 66%. 2010-2011: Grade D. Math Mastery: 55%, Learning Gains: 60%, Lowest 25% Gains: 58%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2009-2010: Grade D. Math Mastery: 64%, Learning Gains: 68%, Lowest 25% Gains: 57%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2008- 2009: Grade D. Math Mastery: 61%, Learning Gains: 67%, Lowest 25% Gains: 63%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2007 – 2008: Grade F. Math Mastery: 60%, Learning Gains: 65%, Lowest 25% Gains: 54%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup
Reading Coach	Janelle Porter	English 6-12 Reading Endorsement Educational Leadership K-12 B.S. Criminology	3	5	2011-2012: Grade TBD. Reading Mastery: 32%, Learning Gains: 54%, Lowest 25% Gains: 59%. Writing 91% 2010-2011: Grade D. Reading Mastery: 27%, Learning Gains: 41%, Lowest 25% Gains: 40%. Writing: 87%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2009-2010: Grade D. Reading Mastery: 26%, Learning Gains: 38%, Lowest 25% Gains: 43%. Writing: 86%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup. 2002-2006 Matthew Gilbert Middle School 2002-2004: Grade C; AYP: Met; 52% BQ;Writing:87% 2008-2009: Jean Ribault Middle School

					2008-2009: Grade: B: AYP: Yes; 79% BQ; Writing: 97% 2009-2010: William M. Raines High School 2009-2010: William M. Raines High School
Science Coach	James Stuckey	Bachelor of Arts Secondary Science: Biology	7	2	2011-2012: Grade TBD. Science Mastery 42% 2010-2011: Grade D. Science Mastery: 32%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup.
Reading Coach	Denise Boddie	Elementary Education English 6-12 ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsement	1	1	Arlington Midde 2011 – 2012 (B) 79% BQ Growth 2010 – 2011 (C) 72% BQ Growth First Coast High School 2009 – 2010 (D) Lake Shore Middle 2008 – 2009 (C) 2007 – 2008 (D)
Standards Coach	Brooke Roth	Secondary Education English 5-12 ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed M.Ed Educational Leadership	8	1	Edward H. White High School 2011-2012: Grade TBD. Reading Mastery: 32%, Learning Gains: 54%, Lowest 25% Gains: 59%. Writing 91% 2010-2011: Grade D. Reading Mastery: 27%, Learning Gains: 41%, Lowest 25% Gains: 40%. Writing: 87%. We did not make AYP in any subgroup.

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	To effectively recruit new highly effective teachers, Ed White invites students to FSCJ and UNF to intern with the hopes of hiring them the next school year.	Janelle Porter, PDF Denise Boddie, PDF	October 2012; February 2013	
2	Once teachers are hired, they are placed in the Teacher Induction Program where they collaborate with highly qualified, experienced teachers in their content area.	Janelle Porter, PDF Denise Boddie, PDF	Weekly throughout the year	
3	To increase the teacher effectiveness at the school, teachers meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities in order to allow them to continue their professional growth.	Administrators	Weekly throughout the school year	

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
62	Informed of need to add SAE; support provided to assist Within Duval County's MINT program for new teachers; assigned a content-specific mentor; attending content-specific district and school-based training; working towards certification and adding Chemistry certification and receiving a professional certificate.

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
155	18.7%(29)	27.7%(43)	32.3%(50)	21.3%(33)	36.1%(56)	58.7%(91)	4.5%(7)	1.9%(3)	12.3%(19)

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
Granville Batey	Lauren Riggs	Same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Andrea Kleinke	Leanna Cota	Same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Brenda Morris	Maariya Bajwa, Lauryn McCarter	same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
James Stuckey	Annalee Shum	same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Julie Jones	Kathryn Brown	same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Keith Morris	John Grabb	same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Leenan Burney	Christopher Diaz	Personal energy level and commitment to students	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
John Goodman	John Greil, John Burton	Proximity, similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Euconfra Corbit	Alex Morales	Same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Jessica Charlton	Jackie Draper	Same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Thaddeus Pickard	Ben Jones	Proximity	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
			Bi-monthly meeting for

Louise Little	Aisha Rees, Ronald Bartlett	Proximity, similar content area	new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Lisa Milligan	Tricie Robinson	continuation from previous year	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Jennifer Smith	Vedia Matthews	Same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Craig Leavitt	Kimberly Ryerson	Proximity, continuation from previous year	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Gary Bilderback	Jacob Close	Similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Brian Seech	Stacey Bennett	same content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Karine Jones	Catalina Vargas	similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Rosalind Hoffman	Zac Taylor	similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Susan Smith	Donna Werre	Similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Tammy Bennett	Cecile Harper	Similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Libby Curran	Jerrell Armont	Similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits
Brooke Roth	Kristen Herzhauser	Similar content area	Bi-monthly meeting for new teachers, PLC's, Differentiated Professional Development, Weekly Cadre Visits

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

Edward White High School uses federal, state, and local services to have available a Parent Resource Center on site, with a focus on use of computer systems to access Parent Portal of OnCourse, continuing education opportunities, as well as volunteer opportunities with our volunteer coordinator. Parent Link is used to contact parents with important information. I We have a part-time truancy officer to check attedance and other school related issues,when necessary.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

None Applicable

Title I, Part D

None Applicable

Title II

None Applicable

Title III

None Applicable

Title X- Homeless

Ed White High School partners with the DCPS Homeless Education Program to ensure equality of educational access for all students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

None Applicable

Violence Prevention Programs

None Applicable

Nutrition Programs

This service is coordinated by Chartwell Food Services and hired by the Duval County Public Schools.Families are encouraged to apply for free or reduced lunch programs through DCPS.

Housing Programs

None Applicable

Head Start

None Applicable

Adult Education

None Applicable

Career and Technical Education

Ed White High School offers a variety of career and technical opportunities for students including Busineess Entrepreneurship and the Career Academy.

Job Training

None Applicable

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based MTSS leadership team is comprised of the principal, assistant principals, reading coaches, math coach, science coach, SLA site lead, VE site lead, guidance counselors, and the IB coordinator.

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?

Each meeting is formatted so that the issues discussed are generated through the administration meetings then processed through the coaches' meetings. The Principal generates the ideas and agendas to lead team meetings. Each member brings their data points and observational data on school processes and student issues to discuss amongst the members of the team. Once the different teams have met to determine the issues and the steps of support then the MTSS group moves forward to determine next steps. Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionist positions will be utilized to support the moves.

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

The MTSS will be responsible for managing and coordinating these efforts between all school teams as well as reviewing and revising the School Improvement Plan. Teams of teachers have been utilized throughout the entire process of developing 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.

FCAT data, FAIR data, FCIM mini-lesson results, district writing prompts, GPA, suspensions, attendance and tardies are the primary data sets that were pulled in support of the tiered interventions and decisions related to the goals set out in the SIP.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff will be trained through early release training and professional development as well as through School Improvement Grant trainings and additional support through the coaches and interventionists will be as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Utilizing behavioral and academic data to develop trainings and support plans. MTSS will have its own review items in the weekly administration and ALT meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT is comprised of the specific teachers in the reading department, all administration, and the reading and instructional coaches. Specific members will be selected from the different academic areas to support literacy across all subject areas.

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

Meets to determine the focus calendar and the focus assessments based upon school wide data points and also to help scaffold up the instruction in the core content areas.

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

Improve student literacy and reading scores. Promote school wide literacy initiative. Support the work throughout the school year and the school community.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

*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.

During the second period of enrichment, Edward H. White School has designed a school-wide reading campaign called BEAM UP (Be Engaged and Motivated UP with Reading) to address the level of instruction in reading during second period. The purpose of this program is to provide students with 15 minutes of uninterrupted sustained silent reading at a common time every Wednesday in all content areas. On Wednesdays, students also have to complete a short writing assignment to access their comprehension of the reading.

BEAM UP Weekly Focus:
Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday
Independent reading
(15-20 min) Vocabulary – Teacher chooses reading and picks out 5-8 focus words
"BEAM-UP" – Coaches provide lessons with strategy 10TH Grade Only– Writing Focus Lessons Independent Reading
(15-20 min)
Teacher explicitly models a reading strategy "of the week" with the reading Teacher models how to make meaning of words using word parts (prefix, suffix, root)
Teacher Models
Strategy and guides students through the reading (all contents) Teacher instructs strategy that will help student comprehend a longer passage (chunking, T.O.C., marking the text) Teacher explicitly models a reading strategy "of the week" with the reading
Students practice independently or in groups Teacher guides students through a short passage modeling making meanings of unfamiliar words
Students practice independently or in groups Teacher provides (2-pg non-fiction) reading passage Teacher guides student through article of their choice
Independent practice for students Students practice independently or in groups Teacher reviews reading and questions with students.
Students practice independently or in groups Students practice independently or in groups
Students file work in their portfolios for this class; teacher collects Students file work in their portfolios for this class; teacher collects Students file work in their portfolios for this class; teacher collects Students file work in their portfolios for this class; teacher collects Students file work in their portfolios for this class; teacher collects

*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?

Ed White's curriculum concept, supported by appropriate instruction and assessment, is designed to raise students' academic and vocational skills. It enables students to succeed either in securing higher paying and satisfying employment after high school or in having a general career focus when continuing their education in college or technical school. To a great extent, an applied and integrated curriculum embodies what research shows about meaningful, engaged learning. Students acquire a broader, more in-depth understanding of academic material and apply what they learn to real-life situations, better preparing them to for post secondary endeavors.

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?

The master scheduling team has incorporated several strategies to assist students with academic and career planning. Credit checks are completed by guidance counselors help to ensure that students are on track to graduate. During this check, guidance counselors discuss postsecondary options such as college, military or vocational services to assist with job training. AP/IB classes are selected by students based on preference, college track, aligned with graduation requirements, and to meet

the requirements for specific graduation from the programs (AP Honors or IB). IB students take courses in Inquiry Skills which also focus on college and career preparations while helping to guide their four year plans towards those end goals. AP students will use My College QuickStart to help them select colleges based on career choices and current ability levels. In addition, our school works in conjunction with local businesses and colleges to offer college, career, and financial aid workshops throughout the year.

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. Reading Goal #1a:	The percentage of High Achievement in Reading scoring Level 3 on the 2011 Reading FCAT will increase 8 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (138)	25% (231)

Problem-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	1.1 All teachers are not providing rigorous instruction	1.1 Teachers will utilize the research block to give explicit instruction to target individual student needs	1.1 Teachers will utilize the research block to give explicit instruction to target individual student needs	1.1 Teachers will conduct PLC discussion to monitor student progress and the level of rigor.	1.1 Student Portfolios, Administrative feedback, and classroom walk-throughs.
2	1.2 All teachers will assign performance tasks that align with assessment noted learning schedule.	1.2 Teachers will administer progress monitoring assessments.	1.2 Reading Coaches	1.2 Review data sets to ensure that teachers have created an assessment that aligns with standardized assessment.	1.2 District benchmark, FAIR, PMA.
3	1.3 Incorporating the school wide reading strategies into lessons daily is not visible.	1.3 Teachers will administer progress monitoring assessments.	1.3 Reading Coaches	1.3 Review data sets to ensure that teachers have created an assessment that aligns with standardized assessment.	1.3 District benchmark, FAIR, PMA.
4	1.4 Some teachers need assistance with how to use their data to drive instruction and determine instructional changes.	1.4 During PLCs teachers will discuss and create lessons using data sets.	1.4 Reading Coaches	1.4 Administration will review teacher conference logs. Coaches will assist teachers during PLCs with analyzing data.	1.4 PLC minutes, student data chat forms, and lesson plans
5	1.5 All teachers will utilize the gradual release model	1.5 Teacher instruction will align essential questions, benchmarks, and objectives after unpacking benchmarks to effectively implement learning schedules.	1.5 Assistant Principals and Reading Coaches.	1.5 Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes	1.5 Student work samples.
6					

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Incorporating the school-wide reading strategies into lessons daily is not visible.	Reading Coaches will provide professional development on reading strategies for all content areas.	Reading Coaches	Review student work, AP observations	Administrative feedback and classroom walk-throughs

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The students achieving above proficiency (scoring Level 4 and 5) in reading will increase 9 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (71)	17% (157)

	Problem-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	2.1 The instructional delivery does not challenge the students, nor match the level of rigor of the assessments.	2.1 Teachers will utilize Webb's Depth of Knowledge and test specification to structure lessons.	2.1 Reading Coaches	2.1 Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans, analyzing student data	2.1 Assess student work and data chats with students (data chat logs)
2	2.2 Teachers lack higher order questions throughout their instructional delivery.	2.2 Reading Coaches will provide teachers with higher order questioning professional development. Reading Coaches will model how to write and identify cognitive complexity questions.	2.2 Reading Coaches	2.2 Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans, analyzing student data	2.2 Assess student work and data chats with students (data chat logs)
3	2.3 All teachers will utilize the gradual release model	2.3 Teacher instruction will align essential questions, benchmarks, and objectives after unpacking benchmarks to effectively implement learning schedules.	2.3 Reading Coaches	2.3 Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes	2.3 Student work samples.

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Teachers are not always reinforcing the importance of each assessment so students learn to take ownership of their learning.</td><td>The school will implement a testing protocol for FAIR, district benchmarks, and progress monitoring.</td><td>Reading Coaches and Administrators</td><td>Reading Coaches and Administrators</td><td>Review data sets and teacher conferences</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making reading learning gains on the 2011 FCAT Reading will increase 6 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (362)	47% (434)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>3.1
Teachers are not including comprehension checks in their instructional delivery.</td><td>3.1
Reading Coaches will model how to embed comprehension checks throughout the workshop model.</td><td>3.1
Reading Coaches & Assistant Principals</td><td>3.1
Classroom walk-throughs</td><td>3.1
PLC discussion and administrative feedback</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>3.2
All teachers will utilize the gradual release model</td><td>3.2
Teacher instruction will align essential questions, benchmarks, and objectives after unpacking benchmarks to effectively implement learning schedules.</td><td>3.2
Assistant Principals and Reading Coaches.</td><td>3.2
Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes</td><td>3.2
Student work samples.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>3.3
Incorporating the school-wide reading strategies into lessons daily is not visible.</td><td>3.3
Reading Coaches will provide professional development on reading strategies for all content</td><td>3.3
Reading Coaches</td><td>3.3
Review student work, AP observations</td><td>3.3
Administrative feedback and classroom walk-throughs</td></tr>
</table>

					areas.
4	3.4 Teachers are not following the reading instructional focus calendar in reading, language arts, and social studies classes.	3.4 Teachers will teach daily focus lessons in every class.	3.4 Reading Coaches and APs	3.4 Classroom walk-throughs, PLC meetings	3.4 Lesson plans, student work

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

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

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	All teachers will utilize the gradual release model	Teacher instruction will align essential questions, benchmarks, and objectives after unpacking benchmarks to effectively implement learning schedules.	Assistant Principals and Reading Coaches.	Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes	Student work samples.
2	All teachers are not providing rigorous instruction.	Teachers will utilize the research block to give explicit instruction to target individual student needs.	Reading Coaches and Assistant Principals.	Teachers will conduct PLC discussion to monitor student progress and the level of rigor.	Student Portfolios Administrative feedback, and classroom walk-throughs.

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of the lowest 25% in reading on the 2011 FCAT Reading will increase 6 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (88)	46% (106)

<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	4.1 Teachers are not always reinforcing the importance of each assessment so students	4.1 The school will implement a testing protocol for FAIR, district benchmarks, and	4.1 Reading Coaches and Administrators	4.1 Review all data sets.	4.1 Review data sets and teacher conferences.

	learn to take ownership of their learning.	progress monitoring.			
2	4.2 Incorporating the school-wide reading strategies into lessons daily is not visible.	4.2 Reading Coaches will provide professional development on reading strategies for all content areas.	4.2 Reading Coaches	4.2 Review student work, AP observations	4.2 Administrative feedback and classroom walk-throughs
3	4.3 Teachers are not following the reading instructional focus calendar in reading, language arts, and social studies classes.	4.3 Teachers will teach daily focus lessons in every class.	4.3 Reading Coaches and APs	4.3 Classroom walk-throughs, PLC meetings	4.3 Lesson plans, student work
4	4.4 All teachers will utilize the gradual release model	4.4 Teacher instruction will align essential questions, benchmarks, and objectives after unpacking benchmarks to effectively implement learning schedules.	4.4 Assistant Principals and Reading Coaches.	4.4 Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes	4.4 Student work samples.
5	4.5 Teachers do not scaffold instruction to meet the needs of various reading level students in class.	4.5 Reading Coaches will model how to differentiate instruction through creating learning groups.	4.5 Reading Coaches and Administrations	4.5 Review student work, classroom walk-throughs, student conferencing.	4.5 Administrative feedback, student data logs.

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

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

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in reading for AYP is 26%. In order to meet Safe Harbor the percentage should increase 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 37% (307) Black: 19% (502)	White: () Black: ()

Problem-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	5a.1 Teachers and administrations must consistency must assess and review data and	5a.1 Teachers will recommend students for small group instruction. Coaches will create and teach lessons	5a.1 Reading Coaches and Administrators	5a.1 Student writing samples and small group discussion.	5a.1 Teacher data reports and student portfolios.

	student work	using test specifications.			
2	5a.2 Teachers will work collaboratively in professional learning communities and conduct a lesson study.	5a.2 During PLCs teachers will assess student data and create a lesson for a lesson study review with the support of Reading Coaches.	5a.2 Reading Coaches and Administration	5a.2 Teachers will debrief weekly in PLCs to discuss what worked and what did not work.	5a.2 PLC minutes, student survey, administrative feedback.

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:	The number of English Language Learners (ELL) students is less than 30; therefore, no data was provided.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
tbd	tbd

<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	5B.1 Teachers must consistently assess and review student data and work.	5B.1 Teachers will recommend students for small group instruction and coaches will create lessons using benchmarks to model to assist with student mastery.	5B.1 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5B.1 Review and assess student work with writing embedded in the small group instruction.	5B.1 Student Data/Trends Student Portfolios
2	5B.2 Teachers will consistently incorporate the school wide reading strategies into their lessons daily.	5B.2 The school will implement school wide reading strategies for all content areas.	5B.2 Assistant Principal Reading Coaches	5B.2 Review student work to ensure teachers are embedding the strategies accordingly.	5B.2 Classroom focus walks

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at or above grade level in reading for AYP is 27%. In order to meet Safe Harbor the percentage should increase to 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (38)	34% ()

<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	5C.1 Teachers must consistently assess and review student data and work.	5C.1 Teachers will recommend students for small group instruction and coaches will create lessons using	5C.1 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5C.1 Review and assess student work with writing embedded in the small group instruction.	5C.1 Student Data/Trends Student Portfolios

	benchmarks to model to assist with student mastery.			
2	5C.2 Teachers must work collaboratively in professional learning communities to conduct a lesson study.	5C.2 Teachers will assess student data and decide which benchmark they will create a lesson for lesson study process.	5C.2 PLC Groups Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5C.2 Debrief and analyze lesson and decide what worked and did not work.	5C.2 Observation Forms Student Surveys

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring at or above grade level in reading for AYP is 25%. In order to meet Safe Harbor the percentage should increase to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (126)	33% ()

Problem-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	5D.1 Teachers must consistently teach the FCIM lessons with fidelity and as scripted.	5D.1 FCIM materials will be created during the second semester to address the reading benchmarks that need to be mastered.	5D.1 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5D.1 Review data from district benchmarks and progress monitoring assessments to assess student learning.	5D.1 District Benchmarks FAIR Assessments
2	5D.2 Teachers must work collaboratively in professional learning communities to conduct a lesson study.	5D.2 Teachers will assess student data and decide which benchmark they will create a lesson for lesson study process.	5D.2 PLC Groups Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5D.2 Debrief and analyze lesson and decide what worked and did not work.	5D.2 Observation Forms Student Surveys
3	5D.3 Teachers must consistently assess and review student data and work.	5D.3 Teachers will recommend students for small group instruction and coaches will create lessons using benchmarks to model to assist with student mastery.	5D.3 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	5D.3 Review and assess student work with writing embedded in the small group instruction.	5D.3 Student Data/Trends Student Portfolios

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						

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goa

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	The percentage of High Achievement in Math scoring Level 4-6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase 4
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (25)	75% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1B.1. Number of New Teachers working in the EESS department	1B.1. Professional development with staff on differentiation	1B.1. Math Coaches	1B.1. Review student work to ensure teachers are embedding the strategies accordingly	1B.1. Classroom focus walks
2	1B.2. Familiarity with the assessment	1B.2. Professional development conducted by the EESS Lead teacher on Item Specifications for the assessment	1B.2. EESS Lead Teacher	1B.2. Professional Development Logs	1B.2. Classroom focus walks

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	The percentage of High Achievement in Reading scoring Level 7 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase 7
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (5)	15% (9)

Problem-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	2B.1. Number of New Teachers working in the EESS department	2B.1. Professional development with staff on differentiation	2B.1. Reading Coaches	2B.1. Review student work to ensure teachers are embedding the strategies accordingly	2B.1. Classroom focus walks

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	The percentage of students making leaning gains in math on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase by 6 percentage points.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
65% (23)	70% (26%)	

Problem-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	3B.1. Number of New Teachers working in the EESS department	3B.1. Professional development with staff on differentiation	3B.1. Reading Coaches	3B.1. Review student work to ensure teachers are embedding the strategies accordingly	3B.1. Classroom focus walks
2	3B.2. Familiarity with the assessment	3B.2. Professional development conducted by the EESS Lead teacher on Item Specifications for the assessment	3B.2. EESS Lead Teacher	3B.2. Professional Development Logs	3B.2. Classroom focus walks

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1 will increase by 5 percentage points.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
35% (352)	40% (403)	

Problem-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	1.1. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	1.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items;	1.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Algebra 1 Administrator	1.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols.	1.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites			
2	1.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	1.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	1.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	1.2	1.2
3	1.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	1.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	1.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	1.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	1.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	1.4 Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	1.4 PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	1.4 Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	1.4 Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	1.4 Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1 will increase by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (81)	10% (101)

Problem-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	2.1. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	2.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test	2.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	2.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols	2.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

		items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites			
2	2.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	2.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	2.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	2.2.	2.2.
3	2.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	2.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	2.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	2.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	2.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	2.4 Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	2.4 PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	2.4 Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	2.4 Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	2.4 Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

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. Algebra Goal #3B:	The percentage of student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:

file is not yet updated for 2012.

Problem-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	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3B.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3B.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	3B.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols	3B.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3B.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	3B.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	3B.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	3B.2.	3B.2
3	3B.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3B3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3B.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3B.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3B.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	3B.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	3B.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	3B.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3B.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3B.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	The percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	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
1	3C.1. a)Students struggle to use correct terminology in math b) Students struggle to understand word problems c) Students struggle to understand word problems	3C.1. a)Identify primary language Use visual pictures Use of dictionary and glossary in class Use district ELL workbook b) Modify the assignment c) Glencoe resources	3C.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator ESOL teacher	3C.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3C.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3C.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3C.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3C.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator ESOL teacher	3C.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols	3C.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3C.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3C.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3C.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3C.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3C.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	3C.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	3C.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	3C.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3C.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3C.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	The percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	TBD

		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	3D.1. Students' level of prior knowledge Retainment of knowledge Reading level is lower than textbook Staying focus	3D.1. RTI Extended time Note-taking skills Keep student near teacher Transpose lesson to lower reading level Utilize Learning Strategy teachers Parental Involvement Know student's accommodations and modifications	3D.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator EE/SS Support Facilitator RTI committee Parents	3D.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3D.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3D.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3D.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3D.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator EE/SS Support Facilitator RTI committee	3D.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3D.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3D.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3D.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3D.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3D.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3D.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	3D.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	3D.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	3D.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3D.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3D.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	TBD
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	3E.1. Lack of supplies Technology outside of school Different set of responsibilities Education is not primary focus	3E.1. Identify students Offer snacks during after-school tutoring Provide supplies Differentiate Instruction Contact Parents	3E.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator Parents	3E.1. Looking at student protocols	3E.1. Teacher observation
2	3E.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3E.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3E.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	3E.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3E.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3E.3 Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3E.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3E.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3E.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3E.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	3E.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	3E.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	3E.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3E.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3E.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

End of Algebra EOC Goal

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	1.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	1.1. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	1.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	1.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	1.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	1.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	1.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	1.2.	1.2.
3	1.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	1.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	1.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	1.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	1.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	1.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	1.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	1.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	1.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	1.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	10% (34)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	2.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	2.1. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	2.1. re- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	2.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	2.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	2.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	2.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	2.2.	2.2.
3	2.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	2.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	2.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	2.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	2.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	2.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	2.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	2.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	2.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	2.4. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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. Geometry Goal #3B:	The percentage of student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3B.1. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3B.1. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	3B.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3B.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3B.2. Lack of resources Lack of availability if computers to allow students to practice taking the test on-line	3B.2. Teachers will use Donor Choose; Teachers will receive class sets of appropriate calculators; Plan time for students to use computer lab to build endurance; Encourage students to take advantage of on-line resources from state and textbook at home	3B.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Leadership Team	3B.2.	3B.2.
3	3B.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3B.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3B.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3B.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3B.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
	3B.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive	3B.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group	3B.4. Classroom teachers	3B.4. Pre- and post-benchmark	3B.4. Reports on various

4	instruction and group students	students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	The percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase by ? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	TBD

<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	3C.1. a)Students struggle to use correct terminology in math b) Students struggle to understand word problems c) Students struggle to understand word problems	3C.1. a)Identify primary language Use visual pictures Use of dictionary and glossary in class Use district ELL workbook b) Modify the assignment c) Glencoe resources	3C.1 Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator ESOL teacher	3C.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3C.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3C.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3C.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3C.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator ESOL teacher	3C.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3C.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3C.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3C.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3C.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3C.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3C.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
	3C.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group	3C.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive	3C.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional	3C.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons	3C.4 Reports on various assessments;

| 4 | students | focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding | Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator | Exit Slips Looking at student protocols | Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation |

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:	The percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase by? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	TBD

<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	3D.1. Students' level of prior knowledge Retainment of knowledge Reading level is lower than textbook Staying focus	3D.1. RTI Extended time Note-taking skills Keep student near teacher Transpose lesson to lower reading level Utilize Learning Strategy teachers Parental Involvement Know student's accommodations and modifications	3D.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator EE/SS Support Facilitator RTI committee Parents	3D.1. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3D.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3D.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3D.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3D.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator EE/SS Support Facilitator RTI committee	3D.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols.	3D.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3D.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3D.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3D.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3D.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3D.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
	3D.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive	3D.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group	3D.4. Classroom teachers	3D.4. Pre- and post-benchmark	3D.4. Reports on various

| | 4 | instruction and group students | students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding | Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator | Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols | assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation |

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:	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Geometry will increase by? percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
TBD Search School Accountability Reports 1999 to 2011 (includes School Grades, AYP, and School Report Card) This file is not yet updated for 2012.	TBD

<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	3E.1. Lack of supplies Technology outside of school Different set of responsibilities Education is not primary focus	3E.1. Identify students Offer snacks during after-school tutoring Provide supplies Differentiate Instruction Contact Parents	3E.1. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator Parents	3E.1. Looking at student protocols.	3E.1. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
2	3E.2. Students who lack test taking skills and confidence, including test anxiety and time management. Students not seeing questions that are equivalent to level of Algebra 1 EOC	3E.2. Students will use 4-column method to answer test/quiz questions; Teachers will model thinking process for students; Teacher will choose questions from state's websites for Focus Lessons that model test items; Students will use PSAT skills; Students will use interactive web-sites	3E.2. Classroom Teachers Math Instructional Coach Math Administrator	3E.2. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips 5QAs Looking at student protocols	3E.2. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
3	3E.3. Planning for and use of higher-order questions to promote critical thinking and deeper understanding (teachers not thinking like students)	3E.3. Teachers will use vocabulary acquisition; Use of living word wall; Teachers will complete problems before class and discuss during PLC; Observe other teachers Unpack the assessment during PLC to discuss knowledge/skills expectations, misconceptions, and questions to use	3E.3. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists Math Administrator	3E.3. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student protocols	3E.3. Reports on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher observation
4	3E.4. Teachers do not use Exit Slips to drive instruction and group students	3E.4. PD by math specialists on using data to group students and drive focus lesson instruction Use various forms to check for understanding	3E.4. Classroom teachers Math Instructional Coach District & State Math Specialists	3E.4. Pre- and post-benchmark Focus Lessons Exit Slips Looking at student	3E.4 Reports. on various assessments; Teacher data notebook; Teacher

			Math Administrator	protocols	observation

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
Intensified Algebra	9	Euconfra Corbit	PLC	Every Wednesday Once per week	PLC notes, Exit Slips, Reflections Slips, assessment data (formal and informal)	Leonard Chaplinski
Algebra 1	9	Euconfra Corbit Brian Ulmer	PLC	Every Wednesday Once per week	PLC notes, Exit Slips, Reflections Slips, assessment data (formal and informal)	Leonard Chaplinski
Geometry Honors/ Geometry	9/10	Keith Morris	PLC	Every Wednesday Once per week	PLC notes, Exit Slips, Reflections Slips, assessment data (formal and informal)	Leonard Chaplinski
Algebra 2 Honors/ Algebra 2	10/11	Julie Jones	PLC	Every Wednesday Once per week	PLC notes, Exit Slips, Reflections Slips, assessment data (formal and informal)	Leonard Chaplinski
Upper Level Math	11/12	Frank Calhoun	PLC	Every Wednesday Once per week	PLC notes, Exit Slips, Reflections Slips, assessment data (formal and informal)	Leonard Chaplinski

Mathematics Budget:

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in	

	Biology. Biology Goal #1:		Have 40% of students achieve proficiency on the Biology EOC.	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
	32% (117) FCAT Science 2011		40% (209) Biology End of Course	

		Problem-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	1.1 Increase in requirements moving from Middle School or Earth Space Science to End of Course Exam High Level Questions	1.1. Use vertical alignment with Earth Space Science teachers in common planning	1.1. AP, Science Coach	1.1. Look at student work between Earth Space Science and Biology and commonly grade and comment on the work to clarify expectations in both classes.	1.1. Vertical Alignment, Longitudinal Study
2	1.2. Only 3 of our 6 Biology teachers taught Biology last year. One has never taught the material and the two other teachers have not taught it in over 3 years.	1.2. Pairing new teachers with veteran mentor teachers, Common Planning and weekly PLC's with Science Coach	1.2 AP, Science Coach	1.2. Analyze student achievement on benchmark and 2WA Assessments.	1.2. Increase in the percentage of students who score 70% or higher on district 2WA Assessments
3	1.3. Low performance in critical reading in the content area	1.3. Use FAIR data to track low performing students and drive instruction, Provide professional development to allow teachers to implement FAIR data to drive instruction	1.3. AP, Science Coach, Reading Coach	1.3. Analyze improvement in individual student FAIR data for each assessment.	1.3. Increase in the percentage of students who score 70% or higher on district 2WA Assessments
4	1.4 Lack of knowledge in writing EOC level questions to provide students with equivalent experiences for the assessment.	1.4 Common exit slips and review at PLC's.	1.4 AP, Science Coach, Science Teachers	1.4 Teacher feedback about student work to student and into data folders to document improvements.	1.4 Common Exit Slips
5	1.5 Continued consistent method of reviewing annual assessed benchmarks.	1.5 Implement an instructional focus calendar to address annually assessed benchmarks.	1.5 AP, Science Coach	1.5 Targeted assessments to measure growth in students, Data chats with students.	1.5 Data collected, analyzed and discussed by students, teachers, and administration during PLC time.
6	1.6 Building Test Stamina	1.6 Strategically increasing the number of questions on 2WA's, Teaching test taking strategies.	1.6 AP, Science Coach, Teachers	1.6 2WA assessments that increase in the number of questions throughout the course.	1.6 2WA data
7	1.7 Student Attendance	1.7 Increase the amount of parent contact, Teachers take the lead in scheduling parent conferences, Provide incentives.	1.7 AP, Science Coach, Teachers	1.7 Compare attendance to previous years	1.7 Increase in scores on 2WA's and Biology EOC

8	1.8 Multiple Preps taking time away from school grade classes	1.8 Common TDE's, Early Release Wednesday's and PLC Wednesday's, Increase use of the share drive to allow materials to be quickly accessed and shared.	1.8 AP, Science Coach, Teachers	1.8 Analyze student achievement on benchmark and 2WA Assessments.	1.8 Increase in the percentage of students who score 70% or higher on district 2WA Assessments

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	The percentage of students scoring at achievement Level 4 and 5 will increase from 0% to 20%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Available	20%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1.
Student placement in accelerated courses is based on reading proficiency, not familiarity or previous performance in the subject area</td>
<td>2.1.
Using past course success and teacher recommendations to determine student placement in accelerated courses.</td>
<td>2.1.
AP, Instructional Coach, Guidance</td>
<td>2.1.
Student success in accelerated science courses.</td>
<td>2.1.
Interim benchmark assessments and 2WA's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2.
Lack of urgency due to past high performances</td>
<td>2.2
Pre-IB classes requiring more project based/critical thinking activities.</td>
<td>2.2.
AP, Science Coach</td>
<td>2.2.
PLC's, Students success on assessments</td>
<td>2.2.
2WA's and EOC scores</td>
</tr>
</table>

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
Student engagement through questioning techniques	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff
Unpacking the standards	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff
Common planning strategies	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff

Lab safety techniques	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff
Writing questions to provide equivalent experience in preparation for the Biology EOC	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff
Checks for understanding	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff
Higher order questioning	9-12	Tim Durkin, James Stuckey	PLC, Science Department	Early release, PLC Wednesday	Administration, coaching, student progress and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principals, Coaching Staff

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. Writing Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoring Level 4.0 or higher in FCAT 10th grade Writing will increase 4 points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87% (410)	88% (469)

Problem-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	1.1 Teachers should use writing data using Write Score to drive writing instruction	1.1 Teachers will use anchor sets and the 6 point rubric and Write Score results to drive writing instruction.	1.1 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	1.1 Student Writing Chats Write Score Reports	1.1 Student Portfolios
2	1.2 Social Studies and Elective teachers will infuse writing in their daily instruction	1.2 Teachers will provide opportunities for students to write during the work period and/or closing.	1.2 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	1.2 Quick Writes Current Day Events Exit Slips	1.2 Student Portfolios
3	1.3 Teachers do not consistently create lessons based on their writing targets from Write Score.	1.3 Teachers will create lessons that address student targets on-going.	1.3 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	1.3 District Timed Writing Assessment	1.3 Write Score Reports
4	1.4 Teachers are not modeling using standard writing conventions	1.4 Teachers will provide students with daily opportunities requiring students to use standard writing conventions.	1.4 Assistant Principals Reading Coaches	1.4 Quick Writes Current Day Events Exit Slips Paragraphs Reading Responses	1.4 Student Portfolios Write Score Timed Writings

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers are not consistently assessing student writing	Reading coaches will model how to analyze and grade reports	Reaing Coaches	Reading Coaches will analyze student work and create pull out groups using student work data	Data Template Student Work samples Exemplars Rubric
2	All teachers will not create small group instruction to address individual student needs	Teachers will use their data and student work to determine which students need more assistance to create lessons that address the needs of each group	Reading Coaches	Reading Coaches will pull these small groups to see if students need more improvement.	Data Chats Anecdotal Notes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	To increase the number of students who are attending school at least 95% in grades 9-12th.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
770	700
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
263 (12%)	257 (10%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Suspension Goal #1:	To reduce the number of suspensions, students will receive bell-to-bell instruction and be engaged and on task in the classroom. Hallways will be monitored, during class time and change of classes, to ensure students are in appropriate classes.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
46	38
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
41	35

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
81	75
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
76	70

Problem-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	1.1 Ensuring all faculty uses C.H.A.M.P.s in their classroom	1.1 De-escalate situations among students and staff	1.1 Foundations Assistant Principals	1.1 Discussion of student behavior in Team meetings Assistance from Foundations Team	1.1 Discipline Report Leadership Team Meetings with Staff

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	

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Decrease drop out rate from 35 to 30.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2% (35) DNE's (37)	2% (30)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
Not available	Not available
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4" style="background:#8B0000;color:white">Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)</th></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 colspan="4" style="text-align:right">Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4" style="background:#8B0000;color:white">Technology</th></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 colspan="4" style="text-align:right">Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4" style="background:#8B0000;color:white">Professional Development</th></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 colspan="4" style="text-align:right">Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4" style="background:#8B0000;color:white">Other</th></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 colspan="4" style="text-align:right">Subtotal: $0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4" style="background:#8B0000;color:white;text-align:right">Grand Total: $0.00</td></tr>
</table>

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Goal #1:

Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</td><td>Increase Parent participation and involvement in school-wide events and on-going.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:</td></tr>
<tr><td>15%</td><td>30%</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" style="text-align:center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1.1
Parents work and have limited time to participate in school activities.</td><td>1.1
Establish a series of informational parent sessions that are data and student need driven.</td><td>1.1
House Administrators

School Coaches

Teachers</td><td>1.1
Effective parent sessions.</td><td>1.1
Sign in sheets
Parent Flyers</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td></tr>
</table>

2	Parents have limited knowledge of about what happens with their students.	Develop a documentation system for all guidance, parent, and student conferences including status, next steps and results expected.	School Guidance Counselors House Administrators School Coaches Teachers	Effective Conferences with Guidance Counselors and teachers. Send home parent notices Contact parents via phone, mail or email	Conference Logs Parent notices
3	1.3 Parents rarely volunteer for school activities.	1.3 Provide a list for parent opportunities to volunteer in regular school activities.	1.3 House Administrators School Coaches Teachers Volunteer Liaison	1.3 Successful Booster Club activities Increase in parent turn out during school events.	1.3 Sign-in sheets Parent Volunteer list
4	1.4 Parents not current on what happens at the school.	1.4 Parent Meetings/Nights 4 per quarter.	1.4 House Administrators	1.4 Attendance on 10/11/11 first Parent Night, January, March, and May	1.4 Attendance Sheets Flyers
5	1.5 Parents not current on what happens at the school.	1.5 Increase Parent Portal usage by 20%	1.5 House Administrators Teachers	1.5 Measure usage of parent portal	1.5 Usage Reports Parent Surveys
6	1.5 Parents have limited access to academic sources	1.5 Develop website for parents and web communication opportunities.	1.5 House Administrators School Coaches Teachers Volunteer Liaison	1.5 Usage of school-based parent center Update and monitor school website Increase in On-course usage	1.5 Parents become more involved and we see academic increases Survey Monkey
7	1.6 Lack of participation in school organizations	1.6 Build a successful PTSA/SAC by 10%.	1.6 House Administrators School Coaches Teachers Volunteer Liaison	1.6 Increase in SAC Membership Increase in PTSA Membership	1.6 SAC rosters PTSA rosters

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Safety Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Safety Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA	

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 8/31/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

School Advisory Council activities will include: To assist in the preparation of the school budget, assist in the completion of the mid-year stakeholders' assessment, assist in the preparation of the academic midyear review and to assist in initiating activities or

programs that generate greater cooperation between the community and the school.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
EDWARD H. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	27%	55%	87%	32%	201	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	41%	60%			101	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	40% (NO)	58% (YES)			98	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					400	
Percent Tested = 94%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
EDWARD H. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	26%	64%	86%	41%	217	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	38%	68%			106	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	43% (NO)	57% (YES)			100	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					433	
Percent Tested = 94%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested