FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: POMPANO BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Hudson Thomas

SAC Chair: Jill Narus

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Hudson Thomas	Bachelor of Business Administration, Finance, Belhaven College, Jackson, MS Masters of Education, TESOL, Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern	3	16	School Grades '07- C '08- A '09- A '10-B '11-B '12-A FCAT- Level 3 or above '07- Reading- 56% Math- 61% '08- Reading- 58% Math- 67% '09- Reading- 61% Math- 69% '10 - Reading -58% Math-68%

Position	Name	Degrees/Certifications	Years at Current School	Years as Admin	Performance Record
		University, Ft. Lauderdale, Fl			'11 - Reading- 69% Math - 98% '12 - Reading - 83% Math - 94% AYP '07- N '08- N '09- N '10-N '11-N '12-Y
Assis Principal	Ronald King	Degrees- B.A.- Masters- Public Administration Certifications- Educational Leadership	9	17	School Grades '07- A '08- A '09- A '10 - A '11- B '12 - A FCAT- Level 3 or above '07- Reading- 74% Math- 96% '08- Reading- 80% Math- 98% '09- Reading- 76% Math- 100% '10 - Reading-75% Math-98% '11 - Reading- 69% Math - 98% '12 - Reading - 83% Math - 94% AYP '07- Y '08- Y '09- Y '10 - N '11-N '12 - Y
Assis Principal	Lori Carlson	Degrees- B.M.E.- M.Ed.- Certifications- Music K-12, Educational Leadership	4	9	School Grades '07- C '08- A '09- A '10 - A '11-TBA FCAT- Level 3 or above '07- Reading- 41% Math- 76% '08- Reading- 80% Math- 98% '09- Reading- 76% Math- 100% '10- Reading- 75% Math- 98% '11 - Reading- 69% Math - 98% '12 - Reading - 83% Math - 94% AYP '07- N '08- Y '09- Y '10-N '11-N '12- Y

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	Susan Atlas	B.A. Secondary Education; English 6-12, Middle Grades Endorsement, ESL Endorsement, Reading Endorsement	7	7	2010 A 75% proficiency, 64% learning gains, 58% lowest 25% 2011 B 69% proficiency, 56% learning gains, 39% lowest 25% 2012 A 83% proficiency, 72% learning gains, 78% lowest 25% AYP '09- Y '10-N '11-N '12-Y
Math	Jill Narus	B.A. Secondary Education; Math 6-12; ESOL Endorsement; Educational Leadership	8	1	2010 A 98% proficiency, 82% learning gains, 92% lowest 25% 2011 B 98% proficiency, 81% learning gains, 93% lowest 25% 2012 A 94% proficiency, 73% learning gains, 76% lowest 25% AYP '09- Y '10-N '11-N '12-Y

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	Continue the outstanding reputation that PBHS currently has that attracts highly effective teachers.	Magnet Coordinator, Administration, Staff	Ongoing	
2	QIT leaders hold induction and professional development for new teachers to our school.	QIT leaders	Within the first month that a new teacher is hired	
3	Recommendations from current teachers of highly effective teachers	Current teachers	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
53	1.9%(1)	7.5%(4)	32.1%(17)	58.5%(31)	52.8%(28)	100.0%(53)	5.7%(3)	28.3%(15)	100.0%(53)

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
Jeffery Williams	Bill Hammond	Shared subject area and department chair	Orientation, sharing of resources, pair observations, Marzano training

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.

Hudson Thomas (Principal), Lori Carlson (Administration), Ronald King (Administration), Susan Atlas (Reading Coach), Jill Narus (Administrative Support/ Math Coach), William Bankowski (Magnet Coordinator), Michelle Raymond (Guidance Director), Grace Kelly (ESE Specialist / ESOL Coordinator / Guidance Support), Kathy Fish (Guidance Counselor), Jodi Samson (Social Worker), Deputy Smith (SRO), Loretta Dulberg (Psychologist)

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?

Classroom teachers, administrators, or guidance counselors identify at-risk students that struggle with PBHS rigor and refer them to their assigned guidance counselor. The guidance counselor schedules a meeting time for the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) while initial information in regards to student background, academic history, and present performance is obtained. The CPST analyzes findings and identifies remediation strategies. In addition, the CPST determines if further actions should be taken, (ie., gathering additional data using collection tools, parent conferencing, additional services, behavior plan, etc.). The guidance counselor serves as case manager. Student performance is evaluated on an ongoing basis and intervention is provided as needed. All students have opportunities to have tutoring on Mondays and Wednesdays through NHS, in addition to one-on-one teacher tutoring.

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?

RTI Leadership Team meets to discuss programs that can be used to benefit struggling students. In addition, members of the RTI leadership team are members of the School Advisory Council and are involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan. Specific data points are inspected to determine Tier-One success. Inspection of data points involve tracking of attendance (monitoring of minutes) in conjunction with our attendance waiver, placement and monitoring of students on academic probation, and examination of discipline referrals.

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.

Reading: District mini-BAT (provided on BEEP; results stored on Virtual Counselor), District BAT (Virtual Counselor), FCAT Writing (Virtual Counselor), FCAT 2.0 Reading (Virtual Counselor), EOC Math, EOC Science, SAT/ACT Scores (Virtual Counselor), DAR & ORF reading assessments (Virtual Counselor), FileMakerPro (Vortex). The reading coach tracks students' progress through quarterly assessments. The data is stored and reviewed on Vortex by team members, teachers, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Ongoing staff development will address learning strategies related to NGSSS and CCSS. Additionally, 9th and 10th grade English and Social Studies teachers meet bimonthly to learn the new demands of the FCAT 2.0. Staff will receive training on retrieving data and using corrective measures to address deficiencies in reading, writing, and math. Guidance counselors will provide training in identifying at-risk students. In addition, teachers will be provided with suggested accommodations and interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Math: individual teacher assessments, BAT2

Writing: district assessments in September and December (Virtual Counselor), monthly assessments for students scoring 3 or below (Virtual Counselor),

Science: Our science department has its own in-house version of the district BAT tests on Examview test generator software and also uses BEEP assessments. Test variation keeps the data representative of actual student performance. The results are hand tallied or the General Test Item Analysis reports correct percentages.
Available data is maintained in Word and Excel files.

All pertinent data is used in bi-monthly QIT (Quality Improvement Team) meetings. Struggling students are identified and resources are provided to meet individual needs.

Behavior: teacher referrals (DMS), detentions (FileMakerPro), guidance referrals (TERMS), suspension data is provided from DWH reports.
Grade Point Averages for individual teachers are tracked through quarterly reports. The data are charted and reviewed by the school leadership team. Teachers exceeding the school averages are counseled in individual conferences with curriculum administrator and department head.
Tier 2 and 3 students are given additional support through targeted interventions. Teachers monitor individual progress of all assigned students. Teachers provide after school tutoring three days a week. National Honor Society provides after school tutoring two days a week. At-risk students are tracked through Vortex and monitored by the reading coach and FIRST ("Freshmen Institute Reaching Success as Tornadoes") coordinator. At-risk students are assigned adult mentors. The peer counseling program coordinates student mentors for students in need.
The Struggling Readers Chart is used to appropriately place students in reading intervention classes.
Correct placement is verified by curriculum administrator through the "Non-proficient Readers Not in Reading" report provided by DWH.
The Struggling Math Chart is not used at PBHS. PBHS has a math flow chart that has been reviewed and approved by district math curriculum specialists.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Lori Carlson (Administration), Susan Atlas (Literacy Coach), Ned Oistacher (Magnet), Claudia Singkornrat (Science), Jean Cledet (Magnet), Duke Chandler (English), Paul Fecteau (Science), Tina Gibson (Math)

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

Literacy Coach and Administrator use reading SIP goals to determine priorities for LLT. Group meets bi-monthly to review data, solicit ideas, and plan activities. Literacy Coach and Media Clerk comprise the Media Advisory Committee to make purchasing decisions to enhance literary collections.

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

Continue student-centered book club, school-wide participation in daily Tornado Time Out (sustained silent reading), enhancing classroom libraries through school-wide "Book Exchange." Create online blog for students to review and share thoughts about the books they're reading during TTO or for pleasure.

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

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

Teachers will meet twice a month in Quality Improvement Teams to develop Essential Questions from text-based evidence. Plans will be created by each QIT to meet the literacy goals.

*High Schools Only

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

Students are provided with course offerings that integrate relevance and rigor. Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses allow the students to earn college/university credit while they are still in high school. Themed business and technology classes in the magnet department give students the opportunity to earn industry certification.

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?

Guidance counselors meet with students in individual, small group, and large group settings to provide service for academic and social needs. Academic advisement leading into college preparation, career choice awareness, exploration and planning occurs each year. Students meet with guidance counselors individually each year to identify and request courses for the upcoming school year. Counselors also conduct credit checks each year, with meetings each year as students progress through high school. BRACE advisor speaks at assemblies throughout the year, meets with students and parents, and conducts special interest activities such as the College Fair.

Postsecondary Transition

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

The PBHS Leadership Team analyzes the High School Feedback Report each year to determine strengths, weaknesses, and problem solve gaps in data. The Post-Graduation Indicators section of the High School Feedback Report does not report data for out of state colleges and universities and data are two years old, so the school's Senior Survey is also used to make informed decisions. Some current and previous strategies used to increase postsecondary readiness include: increase Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment opportunities on campus, implementation of a plan to increase participation in advanced coursework by phasing out most courses below honors level, require incoming students to maintain an unweighted 2.5 Grade Point Average, and reading, writing, and math college readiness classes are nested within Language Arts and math sections.

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:	For 2012-2013, at least 34.5% (224) of the ninth and tenth grade students who are required to meet FCAT criteria will score at a level 3 on the Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31.5% (197)	34.5% (224)

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	Insufficient teacher understanding of strategies to teach vocabulary.	Conduct PD on recognizing roots and prefixes related to content area. Provide word strips for word walls in every classroom. Conduct PD on identifying Tier 2 words	Ms. Lori Carlson, Administrator and Ms. Susan Atlas, Literacy Coach	Classroom observation, teacher-coach follow-up conferences	Classroom observation, miniBATs, improved scores on BAT, FCAT, SAT, PERT
2	Performance on the 8th grade FCAT 2.0 does not guarantee proficiency on the 9th grade FCAT 2.0.	Task demands change on the FCAT 2.0 so teachers need to be trained to know the differences and use the task demands when designing classroom assignments, quizzes, and tests.	Ms. Carlson & Ms. Atlas	Literacy coach and administrator will conduct classroom visits to ensure alignment with blended NGSSS/CCSS.	Mini BAT results, BAT 2 results, FCAT 2.0, Learning Gains report
3	Students are unaware of their own reading deficiencies or do not know corrective measures to resolve the problem	Conduct data chats with all 9th and 10th grade students and provide them with the BAT results that pinpoint weak areas	Literacy Coach: Ms. Atlas	Students complete an exit slip after finishing the activity that provides students with insight into FCAT questions in each reading cluster.	miniBAT, classroom quizzes, tests, projects

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:	For 2012-13, At least 54.5% (354) of 9th and 10th grade students will score at or above level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51.5% (322)	54.5% (354)

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	Both 9th and 10th grade students who score at or above grade level in previous grades tend to decrease in scores on the FCAT 2.0 Reading because of increased rigor of the test itself.	Use both large and small group instruction for professional development in literacy strategies that will increase classroom rigor along with the demands for critical thinking in the classroom.	Ms. Carlson, Administrator, and Ms. Atlas, Literacy Coach	Administrator and literacy coach will conduct classroom visits and follow-up sessions to ensure alignment with our goals.	Classroom observations
2	Students encounter a lack of uniform classroom rigor	Provide PD sessions to help teachers identify practices that increase rigor in the classroom	Ms. Carlson, Administrator, and Ms. Atlas, Literacy Coach	Administrator and literacy coach will conduct classroom visits and follow-up sessions to ensure alignment with our goals.	Exit slips after PD and classroom observations

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

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 June 2013, 76% (493 students) of 9th and 10th grade students will show learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (426)	76% (493)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need exposure and practice for the rigors of the FCAT 2.0 reading. This would be accomplished by repeated instruction and practice in every core subject area.	Provide professional development for teachers to infuse appropriate learning strategies in their classrooms.	Ms. Lori Carlson, Administrator Ms. Susan Atlas, Literacy Coach	Classroom observations	Improved scores on BAT, FCAT 2.0, ACT, SAT, PERT

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

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

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

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:			85.8% (69) percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
82.8% (71)			85.8% (69)		

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	Some students are deficient in foundational reading strategies for vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension	Provide all content area teachers with learning strategies to teach vocabulary for the textbook and the subject.	Ms. Lori Carlson, Administrator and Ms. Susan Atlas, Literacy Coach	Classroom observation	Increased scores on FCAT 2.0, BAT, and progress monitoring assessments
2	Students must be given opportunities to practice newly acquired learning strategies.	Provide Friday enrichment sessions targeting the lowest quartile students.	Ms. Susan Atlas, Literacy Coach	Classroom Observation and attendance in the program	FCAT 2.0

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target							
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # By 2017 15.5% of students will be non-proficient 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
	28.4% (184)	25.8% (167)	23.2% (150)	20.6% (134)	18% (117)		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the non-proficiency in all AYP subgroups will decrease as follows: White from 15.1% (46) to 12.1% (40) Black from 20.3% (29) to 17.3% (23) Hispanic 17.2% (23) to 14.2% (21) Asian from 13.6% (3) to 10.6% (2) American Indian from 66.7% (2) to 64.7% (2)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 15.1% (46) Black: 20.3% (29) Hispanic: 17.2% (23) Asian: 13.6% (3) American Indian: 66.7% (2)	White: 12.1% (40) Black: 17.3% (23) Hispanic: 14.2% (21) Asian: 10.6% (2) American Indian: 64.7% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates	Content materials are differentiated by student	Lesson plans and classroom

			teacher and department head.	interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	observations.
1					

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be maintained.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)

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 differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	Lesson plans and classroom observations

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making	

satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be maintained.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	

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 differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The number of Economically Disadvantaged students that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will be decreased by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (51)	16% (43)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials , such as models, examples and questions, are	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

1				appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	

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
Learning Strategies: Before, During, After Reading	9-12 All Content Areas	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	Instructional Focus (2nd Tuesday of every month)	Job embedded follow-up activity, debrief session, and student work sample study	Administration/ Literacy Coach
Using Data to Drive Instruction	9-12 All Content Areas	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	Teacher Planning Week	Completion of PGP/Administration-Teacher Data Chats	Administration/Literacy Coach
School-Wide Vocabulary Building Strategy	9-12 All Content Areas	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	Instructional Focus (2nd Tuesday of every month)	Job embedded follow-up activity, debrief session, and student work sample study	Administration/Literacy Coach
Integration of Common Core strategies into the content area	9-12 All Content Areas	Diane Fettrow	School-Wide	Throughout the school year	Departments will present plans for the implementation of strategies	Department Chairs, Literacy Coach, and Administration

Reading Budget:

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

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	100% of students will be proficient in listening/speaking
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
100% (7)	
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	50% (3) of students will be proficient in reading.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
28.6% (2)	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

| 1 | | | | diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty. | |

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

| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3: | 100% will be proficient in writing |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

100% (7)

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June 2013, 54% (65) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra End-of-Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (103)	54% (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	Early identification of students at risk of not meeting the achievement level 3 in Algebra 1.	Analyzing BAT2 (Benchmark Assessment Test provided by the district)results to identify those that fall below the district mean and remediating those students before and after school and in small group settings to address the concerns based upon the individual data.	QIT manager/Department Chair	BAT2 results and mini assessments within their math classes.	BAT2 and monthly mini assessment and daily IF practice questions.

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:	45.3% (54) of incoming 9th grade students above proficiency will demonstrate learning gains on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42.3% (85)	45.3% (54)

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 have gaps in prior knowledge of Pre-Algebra skills.	Main concepts will be introduced utilizing prior knowledge and students will be required to make a connection to discover relationships.	QIT Manager, Department Chair	Graphic organizers (including KWL charts, Frayer model, etc.) and written and/or verbal responses in relation to the new material.	Assessments including problems with real-world situations incorporating previous courses into the current concept. Application scenarios and projects.

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 2017 7% will not be proficient in Algebra 1. 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	12.83%	11.66%	10.5%	9.33%	8.17%	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	By June 2013, the non-proficiency in all AYP subgroups will decrease as follows: White: 3% (3) to 0% Black: 12.5% (6) to 6% (3) Hispanic: 6.7% (3) to 2% (1) Asian: 0% American Indian: NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 3% (3) Black: 12.5% (6) Hispanic: 6.7% (3) Asian: 0% American Indian: NA	White: 0% Black: 6% (3) Hispanic: 2% (1) Asian: 0% American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal will evaluate teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

				needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	100% of all SWD students to make a learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16.7% (1)	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	Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

				needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	

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:	In 2013 94% of ED students taking the Algebra EOC will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9.6% (9)	6% (6)

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 differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal that evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	Lesson plans and classroom observations

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:	In 2013 3% more 9th and 10th grade students will earn more than 50% of the possible points in each category. Cat 1: Two-Dimensional Geometry Cat 2: Three-Dimensional Geometry Cat 3: Trig. And Discrete Math

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
	9th Grade: Cat 1: 69%(82) Cat 2: 38%(45) Cat 3: 49%(58) 10th Grade: Cat 1: 49%(49) Cat 2: 27%(27) Cat 3: 36%(36)		9th Grade: Cat 1: 72%(81) Cat 2: 41%(46) Cat 3: 52%(58) 10th Grade: Cat 1: 52%(57) Cat 2: 30%(33) Cat 3: 39%(43)	

	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	Early identification of students not scoring an achievement level 3 in Geometry.	Analyzing BAT2 (Benchmark Assessment Test provided by the district)results to identify those that fall below the district mean and remediating those students before and after school and in small group settings to address the concerns based upon the individual data.	QIT manager/Department Chair	BAT2 results and mini assessments within their math classes.	BAT2 and monthly mini assessment and daily IF practice questions

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:	In 2013 3% more 9th and 10th grade students will earn more than 50% of the possible points in each category. Cat 1: Two-Dimensional Geometry Cat 2: Three-Dimensional Geometry Cat 3: Trig. And Discrete Math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9th Grade: Cat 1: 69%(82) Cat 2: 38%(45) Cat 3: 49%(58) 10th Grade: Cat 1: 49%(49) Cat 2: 27%(27) Cat 3: 36%(36)	9th Grade: Cat 1: 72%(81) Cat 2: 41%(46) Cat 3: 52%(58) 10th Grade: Cat 1: 52%(57) Cat 2: 30%(33) Cat 3: 39%(43)

	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 have gaps in prior knowledge of Algebra skills.	Main concepts will be introduced utilizing prior knowledge and students will be required to make a connection to discover relationships.	QIT Manager, Department Chair	Graphic organizers (including KWL charts, Frayer model, etc.) and written and/or verbal responses in relation to the new material.	Assessments including problems with real-world situations incorporating previous courses into the current concept. Application scenarios and projects.

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 #
	In 2017 3.5% will be non-proficient in Geometry
	3A :

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	6.3%	5.6%	4.9%	4.2%	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	By June 2013, the non-proficiency in all AYP subgroups will decrease as follows: White: 6.7%(7) to 3%(3) Black: 6.9%(4) to 3%(2) Hispanic: 6.7% (3) to 3% (1) Asian: 0% American Indian: NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 6.7%(7) Black: 6.9%(4) Hispanic: 6.7%(3) Asian: 25%(2) American Indian: NA	White: 3%(3) Black: 3%(2) Hispanic: 3%(1) Asian:12.5%(1) American Indian:NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of differentiation of instruction	Differentiate Instruction	Assistant Principal evaluates teacher and department head.	Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	Lesson plans and classroom observations.

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

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

NA		NA

<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>1</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</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:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

<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>1</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</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:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	In 2013 97.6% of ED students taking the Geometry EOC will make satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4.8%(4)	2.4% (2

<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>Lack of differentiation of instruction</td><td>Differentiate Instruction</td><td>Assistant Principal evaluates teacher and department head.</td><td>Content materials are differentiated by student interests, cultural background, prior knowledge of content, and skill level. Content materials, such as models, examples and questions, are</td><td>Lesson plans and classroom observations.</td></tr>
</table>

				appropriately scaffolded to meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers provide small group instruction to target specific learning needs. Students are provided opportunities to demonstrate or express knowledge and understanding in different ways, which include varying degrees of difficulty.	
1					

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
Math Curriculum Alignment (Vertical and Horizontal) through sharing of assessments	9-12 Math	QIT Managers/Department Chair	QITs	Bi-monthly QITs, monthly department meeting	Teacher assessment alignment	QIT Managers/Department Chair/Administration
Algebra I and Geometry EOC Assessment Strategies for creation of EOC Plan of Action	9-12 Math	QIT Managers/Department Chair	QITs	Bi-monthly QITs, monthly department meeting	Review EOC Plans of Action	QIT Managers/Department Chair/Administration
Creating mini-lesson that align with the instructional focus calendar and the test specifications	9-12 Math	QIT Managers/Department Chair	QITs	Bi-monthly QITs, monthly department meeting	Review of teacher mini-lessons	QIT Managers/Department Chair/Administration

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

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

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

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

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

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:	In the school year 2012-2013, 95% (310) of the students taking the Biology EOC exam will demonstrate competency in biology by receiving an achievement level of 3 or above. Biology teachers will collaborate to implement Florida's new knowledge standards into their curriculum and to prepare their students for the county BAT midterms and Florida end-of-course exit exams.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6.73% (22) scored below Level 3 on the biology EOC exam. 27.5% (90) scored Level 3 on the biology EOC exam. 65.7% (215) scored achievement level 4 or 5 on the biology EOC exam.	PBHS student performance on the biology EOC exam will result in 95% passing designation.

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	Biology teachers will adapt their curriculum and assessments to ensure that the students' academic performance will be an indicator of their score on the Florida end-of-course examinations	Science Department will continue to work on standards based curriculum and new knowledge based questions to accurately assess the students' mastery of the biology curriculum. Biology teachers will collaborate as a quality improvement team to develop a review schedule for all grade 9 students prior to the end-of-course exam. Teachers will review curriculum and report results to the department head.	Science Department Chair	Science Department will evaluate the standards based curriculum and the knowledge based questions developed last year. Teachers will review curriculum, participate in quality improvement teams and report results to the department head.	In-house Biology assessments and district generated standards assessment 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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	By June 2013, 66% (209) of 9th grade students will score at Achievement level 4 and 5 in Biology 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65.7% (215) scored achievement level 4 or 5 on the biology EOC exam.	66% (215) will score at achievement level 4 or 5 on the biology 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
1	Teachers will adapt their curriculum to implement existing probes in computer based laboratories or acquire new technology.	These activities will use physical probes and interface units to convert electronic data into meaningful digital information that can be used in the application of the scientific method directly to new knowledge requirements.	Science Department Chair	Teachers will participate in collegial conversations by course and develop a proposed vertical computer based laboratory list.	Collegial conversations and QIT minutes.
2	The school schedule will change from a 110- minute block to a 62-minute period. Teacher daily class loads will double.	Lab activities will be condensed and streamlined to fit within the classroom time limits.	Science Department Chair	Teachers will participate in collegial conversations by course and develop a proposed vertical computer based laboratory list.	Collegial conversations and QIT minutes.

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
Biology new knowledge standards	9 Biology	Muriel Dupre	Biology certified teachers	9 QITs and 2 Professional Development Days	Teachers will participate in collegial conversations by course and develop a proposed vertical computer based laboratory list.	Science Department Chair
Physics knowledge standards	10 Chemistry 11 Physics	Lalita Maharaj	All Chemistry certified and Physics certified teachers	9 QITs and 2 Professional Development days	Teachers will participate in collegial conversations by course and develop a proposed vertical computer based laboratory list.	Science Department Chair

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	100% (325) of 10th graders will achieve FCAT Level 3.0 or high on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Writing, 95% (293) achieved a 3.0 or better; 4% (12) did not	We expect 100% (325) of 10th graders to achieve a Level 3 or better on FCAT Writing. As a premier, magnet-only school, we expect all of our students to perform on grade level. Therefore, our goal is 100% of students achieving at least a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 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
1	The writing exam will undergo a change from the current FCAT Writing to FCAT 2.0 Writing. Specific scoring rubrics will be released for expository and for persuasive prompts.	Discuss the changes during pre-planning and spend a Professional Study Day during the first nine weeks to train all teachers on the new FCAT 2.0 rubrics.	English Department Chair	Tenth grade students will write monthly in response to expository and/or persuasive prompts. Essays will be shared among all teachers to be scored by at least two graders. Scores that differ by one point will be averaged. Scores that differ by more than one point will be adjudicated by a National Board Certified Teacher.	Sample FCAT 2.0 writing prompts, data on score differences.
2	Not enough information about changes to FCAT 2.0 Writing.	Tenth grade teachers will be granted TDAs to attend training involving changes to FCAT 2.0 Writing	English Department Chair	Tenth grade teachers will share prompts and student essays to determine best needs and practices	Monthly student writing prompt scores.
3	Change to shorter periods mean less time for in-depth writing reflection.	Tenth grade teachers will share strategies for best practices.	English Department Chair	Classroom observations using the Marzano-based iObservation tool will be done.	Monthly student writing prompt scores and iObservation 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 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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
Pre-AP strategies and vertical teaming	English	English department chair	English department teachers	Instructional Focus meetings	Monitor based on PSAT results in October and student registration for 2012-2013 accelerated courses	English department chair, administrator
Implementing Common Core State State Standards	English	English teacher(s) attending summer workshop	English department teachers	Collegial conversations, professional learning community	Teachers will develop lesson plans and assessments incorporating CCSS	English department chair, administrator
Holistic scoring of FCAT 2.0 writing	English	English department chair	English department teachers	Professional study days	Teachers score their students' essays in subsequent months and enter scores in Virtual Counselor	English department chair, administrator
Holistic scoring of FCAT 2.0 writing, creating FCAT 2.0-style writing prompts	Social Studies	English and Social Studies Department chairs	English and Social Studies Department teachers	Pre-planning	Scores in Virtual Counselor	Department chair, administrator

Writing Budget:

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

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

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

| 1. Attendance | Pompano Beach High School has an attendance waiver |

Attendance Goal #1:	for the 2012-2013 school year. Students absent for 10% of a class (248 minutes) could receive a failing grade for that course.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Daily Attendance rate for 2011-2012 was 96.6%.	Our goal is to have a daily attendance rate of 98%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
118 students had absences of 10 days or more.	In 2012-2013 there will be a 10% (12) reduction in the number of students with absences of 10 days or more.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
97 students were tardy 10 or more times in 2011-2012.	In 2012-2013 there will be a 10% (10) reduction in the number of students tardy 10 or more times.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents and students may lack knowledge of timelines for submission of documentation to excuse absences and the timeline to submit make up assignments to teachers	Provide timely attendance information communicated in writing to students and parents using first day packets, school website, and teacher delivery of information during first week of class.	Administration, teachers, guidance	Evaluation of attendance information by Attendance Committee	Signed copies of attendance policy
2	Stakeholders may not understand PBHS attendance waiver	The school attendance policy will be discussed at SAC/SAF meetings and PTSA	SAC chair, Administration	Informal survey at SAC/SAF and PTSA meetings	Ticket out the Door
3	Student illness may cause excessive absences	Increased communication between parents and the school during times of excessive absences due to illness	If necessary, students may complete class on line or on modifed schedules or using Hospital Homebound	Evaluation of the student's academic progress while on modified schedules or while on Hospital Homebound	Student Report Cards
4	Social, academic or behavioral problems may interfere with student attendance	RTI team will review student attendance data and create a plan with student, parents and teachers to improve attendance.	RTI team	RTI team will monitor student's attendance record	Pinnacle reports

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
Attendance Policy Refresh	9-12 grades. All subject areas.	Ned Oistacher	School-wide	Pre-school meetings and new teacher orientation	Ticket out the door.	Administration/ Attendance Committee

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:	Reduce number of Out-of-school and In-School suspensions by 10%
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
69	62
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
62	56
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

46	41
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
37	33

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None	Availability of internal suspension increased	Ronald King Jill Narus Lori Carlson Hudson Thomas	Monitor external suspension rate	DWH

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	To achieve a 100% graduation rate for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
In 2011-2012 drop out rate was 0%.	Expected drop out rate for 2012-2013 is 0%.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
In 2011-2012, 99.7% of students graduated.	Expected graduation rate for 2012-2013 is 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	Students are employed part or full time during the school year.	BRACE advisor and guidance will work in conjunction with administration to advise students on time-management strategies. Offer students alternatives to finance college goals.	Guidance Director/ Administration	Monitor students and conduct an exit interview with those who decide to leave school to discuss reasons.	Withdrawal
2	Rigorous course requirements	Individual counseling and creation of an Academic Intervention Plan that includes study tools and strategies.	Guidance Counselor	Monitoring of Academic Intervention Plan	Academic Intervention Plan

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

| Drop Out Prevention | 9-12th grades | Guidance Counselor/Social Worker | Teachers of possible drop outs. | As needed. | Student performance and interview. | Guidance Counselor |

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.*	5% increase in the number of parent volunteers registered on the Volunteer Status database
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
101 people were listed as active on the Volunteer Approval Status database 175 parents attend the College Fair in 2011 548 parents attended 2012-2013 school year Open House	5% increase in the number of parent volunteers registered on the Volunteer Status database 3% increase in the number of parents who attend the College Fair in 2012 3% increase in the number of parents who attend Open House for the 2013-2014 school year

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
	Difficulty in encouraging parents/guardians to volunteer.	Program coordinators will use a variety of methods to advertise	SAF Chair and Volunteer Coordinator	Attendance will be taken at each meeting and strategies will be	Parent sign-in lists with an option of best

1		meetings, including "Parentlink", phone message, Open House, and electronic school newsletter.		discussed for improving participation. A sign-in list will be kept in the front office. A reward will be given to the parent with most hours at the end of the year.	method of communication: email, telephone, flyer, etc.

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 teacher will seek certification for Scientific

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1:			Visualization course		
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
1	Time	Quality Improvement Team will meet twice a month to assist	Ned Oistacher	Certification timeline	Certification timeline

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
1	All instructors need industry certification	Provide resources for CTE teachers to achieve certification	Ned Oistacher	Department chair will monitor certification timeline	Certification timeline

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

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

On going review and monitoring of the implementation of School Improvement Plan, guest speakers requested by school stakeholders, ongoing review of accountability funds, review of school budget

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Broward School District
POMPANO BEACH HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011**

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	98%	91%	71%	329	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	56%	81%			137	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?	39% (NO)	93% (YES)			132	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					598	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

**Broward School District
POMPANO BEACH HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010**

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	98%	95%	74%	342	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%	82%			146	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?	58% (YES)	92% (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					638	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested