FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: STUDENT LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Vickie Marble

SAC Chair: Norman MacLellan

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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					
Principal	Vickie Marble	BA Elementary Education 1978, Recognized as a High Quality Principal by Florida State Board of Education 2006, Educational Reform Hero, Center for Education Reform, 1997	8	14	Designated as a High Performing Charter School 2011 Florida Department of Education School Grade "A" in 2011 and 2012 2012 FCAT 2.0 data Reading Mastery 71% level 3 and above Math Mastery 79% level 3 and above Writing Mastery 84% level 3 and above Science Mastery 59% level 3 and above Reading Points for gains 65 Math Points for Gains 75 Reading Gains lowest 25% 62 Math Gains lowest 25% 80 YES Middle school participation points 15 Middle school acceleration points 50 Points minus Middle School participation 629 Rescaled points 666
Principal					

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)
N/A					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1				
2				
3	1. Because SLA is a charter school, teachers are recruited and retained because of the flexibility given to each instructor in the areas of lesson planning, teaching, and the support in helping students succeed. Also, on-going professional development has been implemented to help teachers in all areas of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices.	Vickie Marble	on-going progress monitoring	
4				

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
N/A	

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
24	8.3%(2)	37.5%(9)	45.8%(11)	8.3%(2)	12.5%(3)	70.8%(17)	4.2%(1)	0.0%(0)	79.2%(19)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale

for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Jon Cooley	Matthew Chapman	Both are science teachers	Weekly collaborative planning
Leslie Clark	Tessa Healy	Both are Language Arts teachers	Weekly collaborative planning

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS leadership team consists of Vickie Marble, Principal, Ivonette Stevens, school psychologist; Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison; Sarah Davis, 6th grade team leader; Teresa Porter, 7th grade team leader, and Trina Aker, 8th grade team leader.

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The school based MTSS Leadership team has general education personnel who are the facilitators of PBS/RTI as related from the CARE (Children At-Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. The Leadership Team is composed of: ESE liaison, teams representing each grade level, school psychologist and Principal when needed.

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

The leadership team will be utilizing the continuous improvement model and will be a part of the development of the school improvement plan. The Principal meets with the team leaders and ESE liaison weekly to discuss what the training needs of school staff are which then becomes a large part of the school improvement plan.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The school uses a variety of data management systems to identify students' strengths and weaknesses along with a variety of academic and behavioral data. The academic data that is used consists of the following: FAIR, pre and posttests, teacher assessments, current FCAT scores, FOCUS for science data and the Sarasota County math benchmark assessment.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

SLA has been involved with training staff on MTSSfor the past several years. This on-going training will continue throughout this school year. The master trainer is a representative from Pupil Support Services at the school district. Before school began, several staff members attended RtI training at the ESE summer institute. The staff then comes back to the school site to train the rest of the teachers.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The instructional leader of the school along with the MTSS leadership team and all staff support the efforts of MTSS. We continue to have training on what we as a school can do to reach all students in a positive, successful academic environment.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team consists of the intensive reading teacher, the Language arts department chair, the 6th grade Language arts teacher, and the 7th grade language arts teacher and the ESE liaison.

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

The LLT meets to discuss strategies to improve student achievement in the area of reading along with reviewing data to drive instruction.

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

The major initiative for this school year is the implementation of specially designed instruction in reading/language arts to help with the instructional needs for SWD along with intensive support for all students in the area of reading. We also want to see improved reading mastery in all other subgroups too.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 34%(110) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(221)	Level 3 - 38% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	For the 2011/12 school year, SWD did not meet their AMO target in reading and math. We feel that not enough differentiated instruction was used and specially designed instruction needs to be used by all regular ed staff.	1. Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers. 2. Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and Benchmark scores. 3. Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills. 4. Pull-out program with low teacher pupil ration (4:1). 5. School Wide Support Team - collaboration with colleagues about Students At Risk 6. Professional Development: specialized training on writing strategies/interventions	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Reviewing data from all assessments with regular education teachers,ESE teachers, and Intensive teachers	FAIR Benchmark Assessments Classroom Assessments 2012 FCAT 2.0 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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 37%(121) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(221)	Level 3 - 39% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The school is allowing more time for planning so that teachers who are teaching advanced/gifted students will be able to plan more efficiently so that all students will benefit from high or der thinking skills.	Increased collaboration between all Honors and advanced teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data from FAIR and benchmark assessments to plan instruction and EP goals.	FAIR, benchmark assessments and data from FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%(185)	65%

Problem-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	62% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading 80% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math				
2	The school plans to work with all students so as to increase learning gains in Reading and Math.	Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and Benchmark scores.	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Reading and Math team leaders.	Using data to drive instruction and lesson planning Results from FAIR, math benchmark, classroom assessments and prior year's FCAT 2.0 data.	Results from FAIR< math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, and prior year's FCAT 2.0 data.
3	The school plans to work with all students to increase learning gains with all subgroups.	1. Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers 2. Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and Benchmark scores 3. Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Progress monitoring will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the strategies.	FAIR, classroom assessments, pre and post tests.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(37)	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	62% in the lowest 25 made learning gains in reading 80% in the lowest 25 made learning gains in math.	Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills	Regular ed teachers and intensive teachers Jamie McNeil	Using the data to inform instruction and plan lessons accordingly.	FAIR, math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, previous year's FCAT 2.0 data.
2	Working with all subgroups to ensure that all students in the lowest 25%	School wide support team - collaborating with colleagues about Students who are At Risk Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Professional development: specialized training on reading and writing strategies/interventions	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Team leaders for each grade level	Differentiated instruction in all classroom based on FAIR and Benchmark scores	FAIR, classroom assessments, pre and post test, and previous FCAT 2.0 data

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70	73	75	78	81	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 70%(194) Hispanic 77%(15)	White 73% Hispanic 67% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-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	Helping all students to achieve at their ability level and beyond by providing intensive remediation in deficit skill areas.	Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and benchmark scores Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Larry Deamud, Reading teacher Team leaders for all grades	Using data to drive the instructional process and planning with all teachers.	FAIR, classroom assessments, pre and post tests, and previous FCAT 2.0 data.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

41%	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	Working with SWD on deficit reading skills and and gaps in the reading process to help them understand just how important reading is as they go forward in school.	Using collaboration with the regular education Language Arts teacher along with the intensive reading teacher. Utilizing differentiated instruction within all core classes. Also, small group instruction will be be used with the ESE teacher who works with the students with disabilities.	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Teachers will use data to drive instruction along with designing appropriate lesson plans for students.	FAIR, classroom assessments, pre and post tests, along with previous FCAT 2.0 data.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%	70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Helping all students achieve at the appropriate level in reading.	Using small group instruction, along with differentiated instruction, academic skills class while reaching all students. Collaboration with Language Arts teachers, ESE teachers,	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Jessica Haworth, ESE teacher	Teachers will use data to drive instruction along with designing appropriate lessons to increase student achievement.	FAIR assessments, Classroom assessments, pre and post tests, previous FCAT 2.0 data
2	Helping all students achieve at the appropriate level in reading.	Using small group instruction, along with differentiated instruction, academic skills class while reaching all students. Collaboration with Language Arts teachers, ESE teachers,	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Jessica Haworth, ESE teacher	Teachers will use data to drive instruction along with designing appropriate lessons to increase student achievement.	FAIR assessments, Classroom assessments, pre and post tests, previous FCAT 2.0 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
Reading and Writing using the Common Core Standards	6-8	Chris Lewis	All reading/language arts teachers and all content area science and social studies teachers.	Three times per year First time was during pre-planning	Using data to drive instruction	Vickie Marble

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Utilizing grades 6-8 Reading Common Core State Standards in Language Arts, Science and Social Studies to increase Literacy.	In the 2012/13 school year, the school will have a presenter, Chris Lewis three times during the school year.	Budgeted professional development monies from SLA's operating account.	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $4,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $4,000.00

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:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

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

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

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

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

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 38%(123) Level 3,4,5 - 79%(256)	Level 3 - 40% Level 3,4,5 - 81%

Problem-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	For the 2011/12 school year, SWD did not meet their AMO target in reading and math. We feel that not enough differentiated instruction was used and specially designed instruction needs to be used by all regular ed staff.	1. Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers. 2. Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and Benchmark scores. 3. Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills. 4. Pull-out program with low teacher pupil ration (4:1). 5. School Wide Support Team - collaboration with colleagues about Students At Risk 6. Professional Development: specialized training on writing strategies/interventions	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Reviewing data from all assessments with regular education teachers,ESE teachers, and Intensive teachers	FAIR Benchmark Assessments Classroom Assessments 2012 FCAT 2.0 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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 41% (133) Level 3,4,5 - 79% (256)	Level 4,5 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 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	The school is allowing more time for planning so that teachers who are teaching advanced/gifted students will be able to plan more efficiently so that all students will benefit from high or der thinking skills.	Increased collaboration between all Honors and advanced teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data from FAIR and benchmark assessments to plan instruction and EP goals.	FAIR, benchmark assessments and data from FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (220)	75%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	62% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading 80% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math				
2	The school plans to work with all students so as to increase learning gains in Reading and Math.	Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Differentiated instruction based on FAIR and Benchmark scores.	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison Reading and Math team leaders.	Using data to drive instruction and lesson planning Results from FAIR, math benchmark, classroom assessments and prior year's FCAT 2.0 data.	Results from FAIR< math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, and prior year's FCAT 2.0 data.
3	Students will be involved in intensive math classes to help with their deficit skills.	Collaboration between academic teacher and intensive math teachers. Differentiate instruction within all math classes.	Math teachers Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using previous data and current data to drive instruction along with lesson planning.	Math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments and previous FCAT 2.0 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75%	79%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	62% in the lowest 25 made learning gains in reading 80% in the lowest 25 made learning gains in math.	Collaboration between academic teachers and intensive teachers Small group instruction with focus on deficit skills	Regular ed teachers and intensive teachers Jamie McNeil	Using the data to inform instruction and plan lessons accordingly.	FAIR, math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, previous year's FCAT 2.0 data.
2					
3	Students who have deficit skills in math will be worked with to overcome their deficit skill areas.	Collaboration with the ESE teachers, regular education math teachers and intensive math teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data to drive instruction along with on-going progress monitoring of classwork and assessments.	Math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments and previous FCAT 2.0 Math scores along with pre and post test data.
4	Students who have deficit skills in math will be worked with to overcome their deficit skill areas.	Collaboration with the ESE teachers, regular education math teachers and intensive math teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data to drive instruction along with on-going progress monitoring of classwork and assessments.	Math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments and previous FCAT 2.0 Math scores along with pre and post test data.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	74	77	79	81	84	

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.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or

Mathematics Goal #5B:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 77%(212) Hispanic 88%(20)	White 77% Met AMO Target Hispanic 88% Met AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who have deficit skills in Math along with gaps in Math standards.	Collaboration with ESE liaison, regular math teachers, and intensive math teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data to drive instructional practices in the classroom and with teachers lesson plans.	Math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, pre and post testing, FCAT 2.0 previous Math achievement with the standards.
2	Students who have deficit skills in Math along with gaps in Math standards.	Collaboration with ESE liaison, regular math teachers, and intensive math teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data to drive instructional practices in the classroom and with teachers lesson plans.	Math benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, pre and post testing, FCAT 2.0 previous Math achievement with the standards.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
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:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or

Mathematics Goal #5D:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%	61%

Problem-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	Helping SWD overcome their deficit skills in math.	Differentiate instruction within the regular math classroom along with collaboration between regular math teachers and intensive math teachers. Small group pull-out instruction will also be used.	Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Teachers will use data to drive instruction and plan appropriate lessons.	Math benchmark assessments,classroom assessments, pre and post tests, and FCAT 2.0 previous scores.

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74%	73% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are

Algebra Goal #1:	currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 22%(5) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(23)	Level 3 - 26% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Helping all algebra students understand the seriousness of taking this course for high school credit and doing their best.	Utilization of an algebra 1 pre-test at the end of 7th grade to make sure that they are ready and able to succeed in a high school course in 8th grade.	Jamie McNeil ESE liaison Katie Hunt - Algebra teacher	Using previous data to drive instruction and lesson planning	Algebra I pre-test, classroom assessments and Algebra I mid-term assessment.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 78%(18) Level 3,4,5 - 100%(23)	Level 4,5 - 80% Level 3,4,5 - 100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The school is allowing more time for planning so that teachers who are teaching advanced/gifted students will be able to plan more efficiently so that all students will benefit from high or der thinking skills.	Increased collaboration between all Honors and advanced teachers.	Vickie Marble, Principal Jamie McNeil, ESE liaison	Using data from FAIR and benchmark assessments to plan instruction and EP goals.	FAIR, benchmark assessments and data from FCAT 2.0

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	Increasing the level of progress for white students and Hispanic students who score level 3 from 22% to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% of students taking Algebra I EOC scored level 3 and above.	To increase the level of performance for students who scored level 3 from 22% to 26%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having enough students for a subgroup other than white and Hispanic students.	Collaboration between Math teachers and Honor's teachers so that more students, especially in other subgroups are prepared to take Algebra I and be successful in 8th grade.	Vickie Marble, Principal Math teachers for all grades	Looking at prior years and current year data to drive instructional planning	Math classroom assessments, benchmark assessments and FCAT 2.0 data.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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 I don't have a subgroup for ELL students.	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.	N/A

Algebra Goal #3D:	
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:	All of my economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in Algebra.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
All of my economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in Algebra.	All of the subgroups that SLA has have scored level 3 and above on the Algebra EOC exam.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 43%(48) Level 3,4,5 - 60%(67)	Level 3 - 47% Level 3,4,5 - 64%

Problem-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	Helping all students and subgroups to increase their science student achievement in all of the middle grades.	All science teachers will collaborate with the science department chair to use previous and current data to drive instruction and planning.	Science department chair and all science teachers.	Using data from science benchmark assessments to determine the deficit science skills of students.	Science benchmark assessments, classroom assessments and data from previous FCAT 2.0 to determine what benchmark students have been weak in.
2	Helping all students and subgroups to increase their science student achievement in all of the middle grades.	All science teachers will collaborate with the science department chair to use previous and current data to drive instruction and planning.	Science department chair and all science teachers.	Using data from science benchmark assessments to determine the deficit science skills of students.	Science benchmark assessments, classroom assessments and data from previous FCAT 2.0 to determine what benchmark students have been weak in.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 17%(19) Level 3,4,5 - 60%(67)	Level 4,5 - 21% Level 3,4,5 - 64%

Problem-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	To help all students understand the nature and knowledge of science and its importance now and in the future.	Collaboration between all science teachers and the science department chair.	Science department chair Science teachers Vickie Marble, Principal	Using previous and current science data to drive the instructional process.	Science benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, and previous FCAT 2.0 data to identify the areas of science which need intensive instruction.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85%(95)	87%

Problem-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	All subject area teachers working together to increase literacy and writing skills.	Appropriate training is being provided to all Reading, Language Arts, Science and Social Studies teachers integrating Literacy and Writing skills using NGSSS and CCSS.	Language Arts Department Chair, All Reading,Language Arts, Science and Social Studies teachers	Using current and past data to inform instruction; along with using reading and writing skills across all disciplines.	Writing prompt, classroom assessments and pre and post tests.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34%(38)	35%

Problem-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
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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:	ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage. ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease . ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.7% (313/330)	96.7%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
150	137
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Helping parents to understand that all students need to come to school 180 days unless they are sick.	Students are given unexcused absences when they go on a trip. The only ones that are excused are ones where it it out of the students control; family wedding etc.	Vickie Marble, Principal Barb Foster, Attendance clerk	We would like to see an decrease in parents taking trips during the school year.	Monitoring attendance on the AS 400, along with using truancy as a backup tool.

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:	
	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of

1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
58	42
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
36	20
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
9	9
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
8	8

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Working with teachers to help them understand Positive Behavior Support and MTSS.	Reviewing prior years positive behavior support in conjunction with Multi-tiered system of support.	ESE liaison Team leaders	Reviewing in school suspension data; along with repeat offenders.	Using CARE and SWIST as tools for intervening before students get an in school suspension.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Utilizing grades 6-8 Reading Common Core State Standards in Language Arts, Science and Social Studies to increase Literacy.	In the 2012/13 school year, the school will have a presenter, Chris Lewis three times during the school year.	Budgeted professional development monies from SLA's operating account.	$4,000.00
				Subtotal: $4,000.00
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: $4,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority ( ) Focus ( ) Prevent (•) NA

Are you a reward school: (•) Yes ( ) No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/25/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The Governing Board of the charter school sits as the SAC at the school.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District STUDENT LEADERSHIP ACADEMY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	82%	97%	61%	317	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	64%	79%			143	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?	69% (YES)	81% (YES)			150	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					610	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District STUDENT LEADERSHIP ACADEMY 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	79%	93%	44%	293	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	66%	76%			142	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)	62% (YES)			117	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					552	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested