FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: COTTONDALE HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Jackson

Principal: Jennifer See

SAC Chair: Tammie Newsome

Superintendent: Lee Miller

Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Jennifer See	BS - Elementary Ed, Troy University MS Ed - Educational Leadership, University of West Florida;Reading Endorsement Educational Leadership, (all Levels) Elementary Education, (grades 1 - 6) English, (grades	17	5	2007-2008 AP of CHS: Grade B; reading mastery 52%; math mastery 64%; science mastery 34%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading; black and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in math. 2008-2009 AP of CHS: Grade C; reading mastery 53%; math mastery 58%; science mastery 31%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or in math. 2009-2010 Grade B; reading mastery 57%; math mastery 63%; science mastery 44%; AYP 82%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading; white population did not make AYP in math. 2010-2011 Grade A; reading mastery 57%; math mastery 61%; science mastery 39%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically

		5 - 9)			disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2011-2012 school grade not yet available
Assis Principal	Rex Suggs	MS - Educational Leadership Specialist - Education Administration, University of West Florida Certification: Social Studies 6-12 Varying Exceptionalities k-12 Ed. Leadership K-12	1	3	2009-2010 MHS school grade B; reading mastery 55%; math mastery 82%; science mastery 33%; AYP 85%; black, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2010-2011 MHS school grade not available; reading mastery 56%; math mastery 78%; science mastery 37%; AYP 85%; black, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2011-2012 School grade not yet available

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Tammie Newsome	BS - English MS ED - English Education	5	4	2007-2008 AP of CHS: Grade B; reading mastery 52%; math mastery 64%; science mastery 34%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading; black and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in math. 2008-2009 AP of CHS: Grade C; reading mastery 53%; math mastery 58%; science mastery 31%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or in math. 2009-2010 Grade B; reading mastery 57%; math mastery 63%; science mastery 44%; AYP 82%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading; white population did not make AYP in math. 2010-2011 Grade A; reading mastery 57%; math mastery 61%; science mastery 39%; AYP 79%; white, black, and economically disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in reading or math. 2011-2012 School grade not yet available.

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Recruit- Jackson County works with Chipola College to recruit newly graduated teachers. Jackson County is also a partner with the Panhandle Area Education Consortium that advertises job openings for the district that is accessible on the World Wide Web.	Deputy Superintendent-Larry Moore; Director of Elementary and Early Education-Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-Jennifer See.	August 2012-June 2013	
		Director of Elementary and		

2	2. Retain- Newly hired teachers are provided a mentor and district support through the beginning teacher program.	Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- Jennifer See	July 2012-June 2013	
3	3. Retain- Professional development opportunities through the coordination of local, state, and federal funds sources to increase teacher effectiveness and retain qualified teachers by providing a conducive environment for improving professional knowledge	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
4	4. Retain- provide resources (tutoring for subject area exams, reimbursement for reading endorsement, reimbursement for college courses, etc.) for teachers to obtain their professional teaching certificate; become highly-qualified in subject areas taught; and renewal of professional certificates for veteran teachers	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
5	5. Retain- Support teachers to improve instructional practices through the evaluation process developed through Race to the Top using the Marzano Frameworks.	Director of Elementary Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Teacher Evaluation Manager- Don Wilson; Principal- Jennifer See	September 2012- June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
20% (7 out of 35) teachers are teaching out of field; however, none of those teachers received a less than effective rating.	Out-of-field teachers are provided with professional development opportunities and support to acquire certification in additional subject areas that they are teaching.

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
34	5.9%(2)	26.5%(9)	38.2%(13)	29.4%(10)	26.5%(9)	79.4%(27)	35.3%(12)	2.9%(1)	35.3%(12)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
		Mr. Dilmore is an	

Tyler Addison	Clay Dilmore	experienced teacher and coach who has demonstrated success in the classroom.	Mentoring activities will vary based on the professional development needs of the new teacher.
Tara Jurgonski	Heather Braxton	Mrs. Braxton is an experienced teacher who has demonstrated success in the classroom.	Mentoring activities will vary based on the professional development needs of the new teacher.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Instructional Leader/Resource Allocation - Principal, Jennifer See: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Regular Education Teachers (RtI Team Leader/Content Specialist Tammie Newsome and Student's Classroom Teacher): Provide information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education Teachers (SLP/Behavior Specialist Cassie Ridley): Participate in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers.

Student Services/Staff Liaison (Rex Suggs): Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, and intervention planning.

Data Specialist (Billie Ohler): Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Record Keeper (Liza Speers): Keeps accurate records at each meeting.

Parents or guardians will be invited to participate and contribute to the RtI process.

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?

Jackson County schools utilize a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for implementing problem-solving response to intervention. Each school has identified a school-based Student Support Team (SST), which meets regularly and engages in a 4-step, data- based problem solving method to:
•Identify Problems in (Tier 1 ALL, Tier 2 SOME, Tier 3 FEW)
•Analyze Problems in (Tier 1 ALL, Tier 2 SOME, Tier 3 FEW)
•Design Intervention Plans for (Tier 1 Core, Tier 2 supplemental, Tier 3 intensive)
•Evaluate student(s) response to intervention in (Tier 1 Core, Tier 2 supplemental, Tier 3 intensive)

SST Roles/functions
• Instruction Leader – (Administrator) - Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regularly scheduled times for the SST to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered
• Team Leader – Directs team activities, receives referrals for the SST, informs staff/parents, sets mtg times, ensures the proper documentation is maintained, and sets dates/times for follow-up meetings
• Data Mentor – Assists in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing and interpreting data
• Staff Liaison – Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input
• Content Specialist – Assists in making key decisions about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies evidenced-based interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, collaborates and provides training as needed
• Record Keeper – Documents/completes required paperwork in the meetings, serves as timekeeper, announces agreed-upon time periods for discussion and other activities, informs team when time is running short.
• Behavior Specialist – Assists in identifying function of problem behaviors and developing Behavior Intervention Plans, collaborates and provides training when needed
• Teacher – of the student whose needs are being addressed

- Parent/Guardian – of the student whose needs are being addressed
- Speech/Language Pathologist – as needed –assists in developing interventions for speech/language concerns—provides training as needed to interventionists

The SST collaborates with other school-based teams such as SAC, literacy leadership teams, grade group teams, positive behavior support teams, and professional learning teams to analyze areas of need in academic/behavioral domains, and initiates instructional modifications as needed to increase student achievement for all students.

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?

Members of the SST meet three times a year after universal screenings to engage in data-based problem solving to evaluate the goals of the SIP and target core, supplemental and individual student needs. The results are shared with the SAC.

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.

T1, T2, T3:
PMRN/FAIR reports (reading), JCPA(reading & math K-2), ThinkLinklink (math), Performance Matters (reading, math, science, writing, discipline) Pinnacle (reading, math, science), District Writing, Office Discipline Referrals/TERMS

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Staff Liaison on the SST will continue to collaborate with grade groups on the PS/RtI process.
District PS/RtI Coordinator will continue to provide training and consultation with the school-based SST throughout the school year. New teachers will receive training on the PS/RtI process as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through district wide trainings, as well as onsite trainings and consultation, and through collaboration with all other school-based teams focusing to improve student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Tammie Newsome, LLT Chair, Reading Coach
Jennifer See, Principal
Angela Ostrander, Science department, high school
Tammy Braxton, Math department, middle school
Heather Braxton, Social Studies department, high school
Billie Ohler, Library/Media Specialist

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

The Cottondale High School Literacy Leadership Team meets once a month as a group to provide leadership and support in literacy instruction. Team members learn how to use various strategies across the curriculum and grade groups, then they take that information back to other subject or grade level teachers. The LLT also studies current trends in literacy and best practices for the classroom, as well as data dissemination and implementation of strategies specific to the needs of Cottondale High School.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will focus on Common Core initiatives and lesson study, as well as providing classroom teachers with tools and support for students across the curriculum areas and grade levels.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Teachers at Cottondale High School will be required to meet monthly during common planning periods to discuss student reading data, reading strategies, and implementation of those strategies in the classroom. Teachers will be required to submit weekly lesson plans that include reading strategies, such as word walls, anticipatory activities, effective vocabulary instruction, etc. The Literacy Leadership Team will provide literacy support to subject area teachers on various topics, including complex text, content area reading, and reading informational text. Additionally, the school district will offer additional training leading to NGCARPD certification. This option will allow schools flexibility in placing level two students into content area reading classes.

*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?

Cottondale High School offers applied and integrated coursework in business and agricultural science. The instructors work with the students and the content area teachers to ensure that the material being presented is relevant to other subject areas and to the needs of the students.

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?

All 8th grade students must take a semester career planning course. The students will use CHOICES for exploration of career options and skills. This better prepares the student for the course selection process. All students in grades eight through twelve must complete a career education plan based on the goals and interests of the students for graduation. All students in 11th grade must take the ASVAB test and participate in the interpretive follow-up session. The guidance counselor and career counselor meet with individual students and parents, as well as provide information on post-secondary opportunities.

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

Cottondale High School students attend career and college days at various times throughout the school year in order to explore some of the options that are available after graduation. In addition, a majority of 10th grade students at CHS take the PLAN test every year, and a majority of students also take either the ACT or the SAT. Students are encouraged to speak with both the guidance counselor and career specialist at various times throughout their high school careers. Information regarding scholarships, vocations, and careers is regularly disseminated to the students. Many CHS graduates receive Bright Futures awards and other scholarships and grants.

Students and parents are invited to meet with guidance staff to review graduation requirements, scholarship information, and post-graduation plans.

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 24% (96) of students scored at proficiency level (level 3) on the FCAT Reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%	30%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instructional support for continued student growth	Provide ongoing academic support for students achieving proficiency	Administration	Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	Data from classroom observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	27% (107) of students scored at levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (107)	30%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Student motivation and lack of challenging curriculum	Provide enriching and academically challengings assignments to students who are peforming above proficiency to ensure continued growth and academic challenge	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, teacher observation	FCAT end results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning

	gains in reading.	Based on 2013 FCAT data 34% (133) of students made learning gains on FCAT reading.
	Reading Goal #3a:	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	34% (133)	50%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student participation and motivation	Provide engaging instructional activities to encourage student participation and motivation	Administration, classroom teachers	Review of lesson plans; classroom observations and walk-throughs	Future assessment performance data
2	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences (such as virtual field trips, virtual labs, etc.)	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as discussions, journaling, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 25% (18) of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

25% (18)		50%	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences (such as virtual field trips, virtual labs, etc.)	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as discussions, journaling, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
2	Lack of access to extended learning opportunities such as before or after school tutoring or help sessions	Provide access to extended learning opportunities through grant funding for students meeting eligibility requirements	District staff, School staff as assigned	Attendance data for extended learning opportunities, FCAT data	Progress monitoring; FCAT end results

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 # By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in indentified subgroup. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53	58	62	66	70	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (67/91) of black students 40% (106/262) of white students	67% of black students 36% of white students

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual	Administration; classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data, future assessment results

		experiences			
2	Student motivation	Intensive reading classes for targeted students	Administration	Periodic classroom walk-throughs and review of progress monitoring data	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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>N/A - No ELL population</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<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>N/A - SWD subgroup data not available</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	BY 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (119)	47%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation	Intensive reading instruction for targeted students	Administration	Classroom walk-throughs, observations, lesson plan review	Progress monitoring data and future FCAT results
2	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences (such as virtual field trips, virtual labs, etc.)	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as discussions, journaling, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of transportation and/or access to extended learning opportunities such as before or after school tutoring or help sessions	Provide access to extended learning opportunities through grant funding for students meeting eligibility requirements	District staff, School staff as assigned	Attendance data for extended learning opportunities, FCAT data	Progress monitoring; FCAT end results

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Using complex text and/or informational text	All grades/subject areas	Reading Coach and/or LLT lead teachers	School-wide	August 2012 and ongoing	Teachers will demonstrate use in classroom through observation, lesson plans, discussion, etc.	Principal, Asst. Prinicipal
Lesson study	Various	Reading Coach and/or LLT lead teachers	Lesson study group	July 2012 and ongoing	Teachers will participate in lesson study cycle	Prinicipal, Asst. Prinicipal, Lead teacher
Common Core implementation	All grades/subject areas	Kathy Oropalla	School-wide	August 2012 and ongoing	Teachers will document Common Core standards and implementation through lesson plans, observation, etc.	Prinicpal, Asst. Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lexia	Computer based reading remediation program	Title I Part D; IDEA	$500.00
Newsbank	Informational text database	Title I Part D	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
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
Common Core Institutes		RTT	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	N/A
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
N/A	

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

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:	N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

N/A

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 24% (58) of students scored at level 3 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (58)	30%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instructional support for continued student growth	Provide ongoing academic support for students achieving proficiency	Administration	Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	Data from classroom observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 18% (44) of students scored at level 4 or 5 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (47)	23%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation and lack of challenging curriculum	Provide enriching and academically challengings assignments to students who are peforming above proficiency to ensure continued growth and academic challenge	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, teacher observation	FCAT end results

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 33% (80) of students made learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

33% (80)	50%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student participation and motivation	Provide engaging instructional activities to encourage student participation and motivation	Administration, classroom teachers	Review of lesson plans; classroom observations and walk-throughs	Future assessment performance data

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 18% (10)of the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (10)	50%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of appropriate resources to meet the learning needs of the lowest 25%	Allocate resources for new math program and monitor/update student AIPs and IEPs to meet instructional needs	Administration, ESE coordinator	Continuous review to ensure that all AIPs and IEPs are being followed as indicated	Monthly meetings to ensure AIP/IEP plans are adequate and accurate

2	Student motivation	Remediation and instructional support within the classroom for targeted students.	Administration, classroom teacher	Review of student assessment and progress monitoring data; classroom walk-through and review of lesson plans; teacher observation	Student assessment data; FCAT end results	

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal #
	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup. ▲ 5A : ▼

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51	55	60	64	69	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (39) black students 50% (80) white students	67% black students 45% white students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration; classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data, future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Remediation within math classes for targeted students	Administration, classroom teachers	Periodic walk-through and review of student performance data to ensure effectiveness of math interventions for targeted students.	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results
3	Students lack the necessary basic skills needed to solve high complexity math problems	Teachers will provide targeted direct instructin within the classroom setting; select students will be targeted for additional learning opportunities outside of the classroom	Administration; classroom teachers	Use of higher order thinking and problem solving skills will be implemented and monitored in classroom instruction	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	N/A

Mathematics Goal #5C:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
N/A	N/A	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A - No ELL population	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A - SWD data not available; population too small.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (109)	60%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation	Remediation within math classes for targeted students	Administration, classroom teachers	Periodic walk-through and review of student performance data to ensure effectiveness of	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results

			math intervention for targeted students.	

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	N/A

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

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

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:	48% (29) scored at Level 3 on the 2012 Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (29)	53%

Problem-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	Instructional support for continued student growth	Provide ongoing academic support for students achieving proficiency	Administration	Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	Data from classroom observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4

	and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	7% (4) of students scored at or above Level 4 on the 2012 Algebra EOC.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% (4)	12%

<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>Student motivation and lack of challenging curriculum</td><td>Provide enriching and academically challengings assignments to students who are peforming above proficiency to ensure continued growth and academic challenge</td><td>Administration, classroom teachers</td><td>Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, teacher observation</td><td>FCAT end results</td></tr>
</table>

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 # By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup. 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51	55	60	64	69	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (11) black students 40% (16) white students	71% black students 36% white students

<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>Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences</td><td>Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences</td><td>Administration; classroom teachers</td><td>Student response activities, such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.</td><td>Progress monitoring data, future assessment results</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 subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
58% (21)	52%			

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
		Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation	Remediation within math classes for targeted students	Administration, classroom teachers	Periodic walk-through and review of student performance data to ensure effectiveness of math intervention for targeted students.	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results

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:	6% (4) of students scored at achievement Level 3 on the 2012 Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6% (4)	15%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instructional support for continued student growth	Provide ongoing academic support for students achieving proficiency	Administration	Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	Data from classroom observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	0% of students score at or above achievement Level 4 on the 2012 Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| 0% | | | 10% | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation and lack of challenging curriculum	Provide enriching and academically challengings assignments to students who are peforming above proficiency to ensure continued growth and academic challenge	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, teacher observation	FCAT end results

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 # By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup. 3A :

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55	60	64	69	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (13) of black students 93% (42) of white students	90% of black students 84% of white students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration; classroom teachers	Student response activities, such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data, future assessment results

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	N/A

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	N/A

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	By 2016-2017 CHS will decrease non-proficient students by 50% in each identified subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95% (37) of studemts	85%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation	Remediation within math classes for targeted students	Administration, classroom teachers	Periodic walk-through and review of student performance data to ensure effectiveness of	Progress monitoring data, FCAT end results

				math intervention for targeted students.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Consultant	all	Linda Walker	Math, school-wide	August 2012 and ongoing	Lesson plans, adminstrative observation	Principal, Asst. Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Think Through Math	computer-based math remediation program	Title I Part D; IDEA	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
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: $500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	N/A			N/A	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instructional support for continued student growth	Provide ongoing academic support for students achieving proficiency	Administration	Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	Data from classroom observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	8% (7) of students scored at levels 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (7)	17%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student motivation and lack of challenging curriculum	Provide enriching and academically challengings assignments to students who are peforming above proficiency to ensure continued growth and academic challenge	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, teacher observation	FCAT end results
2	Student engagement and enrichment	Continued improvement in instruction in all science strands.	Administration	Review of lesson plans, classroom walk-throughs and observations	Classroom observation, FCAT end results

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

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

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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:	23% (14) of students scored at achievement Level 3 on the 2012 Biology EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (14)	31%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" 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></td><td>Instructional support for continued student</td><td>Provide ongoing academic support for</td><td>Administration</td><td>Evaluation of lesson plans; classroom</td><td>Data from classroom</td></tr>
</table>

				observations; administration of progress monitoring measurements	observations and progress monitoring; future assessment results
1	growth	students achieving proficiency			
2	Student motivation	Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results
3	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	No students scored at or above achievement Level 4 on the 2012 Biology EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge and/or relevant experiences	Provide real-world examples for students to connect with whenever possible; use technology to provide virtual experiences	Administration, classroom teachers	Student response activities such as journaling, discussions, projects, models, etc.	Progress monitoring data; future assessment results

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science NGSSS	Science, all	District Science Coordinator	Science teachers	August 2012 and ongoing	Lesson planning, classroom observation	Principal, Asst. Prinipal

Science Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Biology textbooks	Purchase new textbooks/resources for Biology	Textbooks	$9,493.61
			Subtotal: $9,493.61
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: $9,493.61

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT data 74% (109) of students met high standards in FCAT Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (109)	80%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of sufficient guided writing practice	Students will use the writing process across the curriculum.	Administration, Classroom teacher	Student writing samples will be collected and reviewed periodically.	JC Writes three times per year, classroom/teacher assigned writing prompts
2	Cultural influences emphasizing informal writing practices (text messaging, email, social media, etc.)	Teachers will use direct explicit instruction and real world examples to teach students to differentiate between formal and informal writing situations	Administration, classroom teacher	Student writing samples	JC Writes three times per year, classroom/teacher assigned writing situations

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

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

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	33% (19) will score at or above level 3
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

| 1 | Student motivation | Provide school-wide motivation and encouragement across all grade levels and subject areas throught the use of PBS | Administration, classroom teachers | Classroom walk-throughs; teacher and administrator observations | Progress monitoring data; future assessment results |

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	The attendance rate at CHS for the 2011-12 school year was 93.02% (447 students present out of and average of 481 students enrolled). 55% of students (263 of 481) had excessive absences of at least ten missed days during the school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.02% (447)	94%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
55% (263)	45%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
N/A - data not available	N/A - data 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
1	Student transportattion and illnesses.	Provide families with information regarding school transportation, health and wellness, truancy, and attendance policies.	Administrators, SRO, classroom teachers, attendance clerk, RtI/PS team.	Monitor attendance data.	Attendance data.

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:	22% (108) of 481 students enrolled at CHS were suspended during the 2011-12 school year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
N/A - No ISS program	N/A - No ISS program
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
N/A - No ISS program	N/A - No ISS program

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
108	90
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
22% (108 out of 481 students)	15%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student behavior and/or rule violations	Use RAs to track and address minor rule violations and to monitor student behaviors	Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers, and staff	Monitoring of RAs and discipline reports submitted to the office	Number or RAs and discipline reports submitted to office

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

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.*	Based on 2010-11 data, the dropout rate at CHS is 0.4% and the graduation rate is 84.3%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2010-11: 0.4%	0%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
2010-11: 84.3%	90% or greater

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic support and intervention for older and/or struggling students	Credit recovery programs; extended learning opportunities for eligible students	Administration; Guidance Staff; Classroom teachers	Graduation rates	Graduation rates

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
Credit recovery	All	District Facilitator	Guidance Office	Ongoing	Student monitoring for completion of required credits.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Guidance

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	78% (47) of parents surveyed report that they have received positive communication from a teacher concerning their child.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
78%	83%

Problem-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	Time barriers for teachers to make adequate parental contacts.	Enourage teachers to make regular contact with parents regarding positive concerns.	Administration, classroom teacher	Parent conference, teacher records, anecdotal notes	Parent and teacher survey
2	Lack of access to online programs to track student learning outcomes, attendance, etc.	Encourage teachers to communicate in alternative ways (other than email, gradebook, etc.) especially for those families who may	Administration, classroom teacher	Parent conference, teacher records, anecdotal notes	Parent and teacher survey

		not have access to online resources				

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:	Increase the number of students enrolled in advanced science, technology, engineering, and mathematics classes, through virtual enrollment and/or college dual enrollment.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic qualification for advanced courses	Encourage students to take the ACT and/or SAT to increase math and science scores to qualify them for advnaced/dual enrollment courses.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors	Evaluation of student course enrollments	Student enrollment documents and course requests

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:	Increase the number of students passing Industry Certification exams.

Problem-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	Exam cost	Help students find funding to cover exams	Principal, Assistant Prinicipal, Guidance Office	Review Industry Exam results	Industry Exam results

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Lexia	Computer based reading remediation program	Title I Part D; IDEA	$500.00
Reading	Newsbank	Informational text database	Title I Part D	$1,000.00
Mathematics	Think Through Math	computer-based math remediation program	Title I Part D; IDEA	$500.00
Science	Biology textbooks	Purchase new textbooks/resources for Biology	Textbooks	$9,493.61
				Subtotal: $11,493.61
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
Reading	Common Core Institutes		RTT	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $2,000.00
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: $13,493.61

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

◌ Priority	◌ Focus	◌ Prevent	◌ NA

Are you a reward school: ◌ Yes ◌ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/11/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount

Miscellaneous instructional materials and supplies	$91.40

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

The Cottondale High School Advisory Council functions in accordance with the state rules and regulations regarding advisory councils. Our advisory council assists in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan and discusses and approves the budget for our council. We meet a minimum of four times a year, and parents, teachers, students, business/community members participate. All persons have input in the school improvement process. The council also give input concerning school needs and any other issues that may arise.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Jackson School District COTTONDALE HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	61%	88%	39%	245	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	60%	68%			128	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?	67% (YES)	69% (YES)			136	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					519	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Jackson School District COTTONDALE HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	63%	87%	44%	251	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	57%	68%			125	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?	55% (YES)	65% (YES)			120	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					496	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested