

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: UNION COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Union

Principal: Mike Ripplinger

SAC Chair: Jamie Dekle

Superintendent: Carlton Faulk

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/13/2012

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	Mike Ripplinger	M.S. Social Science Education Florida Educational Leadership	14	3	2011-2012 School Grade Pending Meeting High Standards: Reading 52%; Math 75%; Writing 90%; Science N/A Learning Gains: Reading 57%; Math 76% Lowest Quartile: Reading 62%(Y) Math 85%(Y) 2010-2011 School Grade B Meeting High Standards: Reading 42%; Math 71%; Writing 87%; Science 40% Learning Gains: Reading 43%; Math 70% Lowest Quartile: Reading 42%(N) Math 57%(Y)
					2011-2012 School Grade Pending Meeting High Standards: Reading 52%; Math 75%; Writing 90%; Science N/A Learning Gains: Reading 57%; Math 76% Lowest Quartile:

Assis Principal	Bill Cross	BS in Education MS Administration	12	20	Reading 62%(Y) Math 85%(Y) 2010-2011 School Grade B Meeting High Standards: Reading 42%; Math 71%; Writing 87%; Science 40% Learning Gains: Reading 43%; Math 70% Lowest Quartile: Reading 42%(N) Math 57%(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)
Math	Barbara Riherd	BS Industrial Engineering MS Education NBCT	4	6	2011-2012 School Grade Pending Meeting High Standards: Reading 52%; Math 75%; Writing 90%; Science N/A Learning Gains: Reading 57%; Math 76% Lowest Quartile: Reading 62%(Y) Math 85%(Y) 2010-2011 School Grade B Meeting High Standards: Reading 42%; Math 71%; Writing 87%; Science 40% Learning Gains: Reading 43%; Math 70% Lowest Quartile: Reading 42%(N) Math 57%(Y)
Reading	Tammy Thornton	BA Elementary Ed MS Education Reading Endorsement	7	3	2011-2012 School Grade Pending Meeting High Standards: Reading 52%; Math 75%; Writing 90%; Science N/A Learning Gains: Reading 57%; Math 76% Lowest Quartile: Reading 62%(Y) Math 85%(Y) 2010-2011 School Grade B Meeting High Standards: Reading 42%; Math 71%; Writing 87%; Science 40% Learning Gains: Reading 43%; Math 70% Lowest Quartile: Reading 42%(N) Math 57%(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	Utilize various methods for maintaining, developing, and scheduling intense, sustained, and research-based professional development in pedagogy. (i.e. Differentiated Instruction, Cross Curricular Planning, Technology Integration, Best Practices, Classroom Instruction that Works, 21st Century Teacher-Teacher website. Actively recruiting new Education graduates from local Universities.	Principal	ongoing	
2	Ensure that low-income students and minority students are instructed by highly qualified instructors, at a rate of instruction that is appropriate, based in the student data.	Principal	ongoing	
3	Assist teachers not currently HQ to meet the HQ requirements in a timely manner	Principal	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
N/A - none of the out-of-field teachers received a rating lower than effective	

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
44	9.1%(4)	34.1%(15)	29.5%(13)	29.5%(13)	22.7%(10)	61.4%(27)	15.9%(7)	4.5%(2)	9.1%(4)

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
Kelly Neal	Terri Brown	Veteran English teacher with documented success on FCAT Writes and FCAT tests.	Each will observe the other's classroom and reflect on these observations. They will meet regularly and discuss strategies
Renee Allen	Kris Bracewell	Veteran Science teacher with documented success on FCAT tests.	Meeting regularly, observing and reflecting upon strategies for reading improvement

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A-Union County High School is not a Title I School.

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.

Mike Ripplinger - Principal
Bill Cross - Assistant Principal
Tangelia Mackay - Guidance Counselor
Stacy Worrell - Guidance Counselor
Peggy Vermont - School Psychologist
Patsy Fortner - ESE Teacher
Carla Dicks - English Teacher
Kaleb Clyatt - Science Teacher
Lee Clark - Math Teacher
Hollie Johnson - ESE Teacher
Tammy Sulsona - Social Studies Teacher
Brian Tomlinson - HOPE Teacher
Lamar Waters - ESE Teacher

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 RtI Leadership Team will focus on developing, monitoring, and maintaining a problem-solving system that

will help increase the success of the students, teachers, and school. The team will analyze data to guide instruction, target at risk students, and plan professional development. All Leadership Teams at the school will work together to facilitate a positive and successful school culture. Meetings will be held on Early Release Days as 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 school-based RtI Leadership Team, provided data and determined the Tier 1,2,and 3 focus for the school, and assisted in the development of the SIP. The process to develop the SIP included analyzing data, identifying social/emotional behaviors that needed to be addressed, and developing a systematic approach to help meet the goals of the school.

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.

Baseline Data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment(FCAT); Florida Continuous Improvement Model(FCIM); ThinkLink Benchmark Aligned Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading(FAIR)

Midyear:

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading(FAIR); Florida Continuous Improvement Model(FCIM); ThinkLink Benchmark Aligned Assessments

End of Year:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment(FCAT); ThinkLink Benchmark Aligned Assessments; Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading(FAIR)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development is ongoing throughout the year and is conducted one half day of each month. The focus of the professional development is based on the student data and is tailored to meet the needs of the faculty.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mike Ripplinger-Principal
Tammy Thornton-Reading Coach
Linda Norcross-Media Specialist
Carla Dicks-Intensive Reading Teacher
Kelly Neal-English Teacher
Julie Denson-Social Studies Teacher
Lynda Petitt-Science Teacher
Mandeep Sharma-Math Teacher
David Reed -ESE Teacher

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will meet to disaggregate the school data, and identify instructional needs based on this information. The Literacy Leadership Team will review progress monitoring data and identify professional development needs and resources. The team members will then collaborate with the members of their content area to facilitate the process of a unified information system. Meetings will be held on Early Release Days as needed.

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

The main focus of the Literacy Leadership Team this year will be to create a positive, data driven, environment that will increase literacy for all students at our school.
The major initiatives will be, increase literacy in the lowest quartile to meet AYP requirements, implement successful interventions for at risk students, and provide resources, opportunities, and support, to create a successful school-wide literacy approach.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Among the highest priorities of our instruction here at Union County High School is to ensure that students can read closely, and gain knowledge from complex text in all content areas. Across the curriculum, a significant percentage of questions and tasks, are to be high quality, and text dependent. Aligned curriculum materials, across all content areas, will include rigorous text dependent questions, requiring students to demonstrate the ability to follow the details that are explicitly stated, comprehend the material, and make valid claims of support that square with all the evidence in the text. Reading strategies, as well as, broader questions and themes will be embedded in the text in all content areas. A significant amount of time will be spent providing students opportunities to work independently to analyze the text, and be successful with the rigor they encounter in reading.

*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?

All teachers are encouraged to create lessons that are relevant to real world applications, allowing students to make connections, and creating a higher level of success.

In addition, the school offers the following applied and integrated courses:

- *Health Academy
- *Construction Academy
- *Business Academy
- *Teacher Cadet Training
- *Agriculture Science
- *JROTC
- *VoTech

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

The guidance department offers academic counseling to all students. The school has two guidance counselors that conduct meetings with students to discuss their career planning goals. Transcript reviews are conducted to ensure that the necessary criteria is being met and the student is on track to reach their academic and career goals. In addition, the school offers a College Career Fair, guest speakers from various careers are invited into classrooms, and through our technology resources, students have the online program CHOICES available to them on campus.

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](#)

Union County High School is preparing students for the public postsecondary level, by offering the following programs and certification opportunities on campus.

- *Health Occupations Certification Testing Site
- *Construction Academy Certification Testing Site
- *Business Education Certification Testing Site

Union County High School is also a testing site for the following state approved assessments:

- *ACT
- *SAT
- *CPT
- *PSAT
- *PLAN

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:	Increase the total number of students achieving proficiency in FCAT reading to 60%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58 of total number of students tested achieved proficiency in reading. 9th Grade=27 10th Grade=31	60% of total number of students tested will achieve proficiency in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling conflicts due to reading placement and required core classes.	Co-teaching Intensive Reading classes have at least one co-teacher during the day, to assist with differentiated instruction.	Principal Reading Coach	Observations Data Reviews Meetings	FAIR Assessments ThinkLink Assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Increase the number of students scoring 4, 5, and 6, on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% of the students taking the FAA scored at Levels 4,5,6. (4/5)	90% of the students taking the FAA will score at Levels 4,5, 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	Staff to student ratio, and meeting all students' individual needs.	Increase the number of staff who are involved with this subgroup	Principal	Observations 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment data review	2012 Florida Alternate 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students achieving above proficiency (Levels 4-5) in reading to 60%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% of all students tested scored above proficiency. 9th Grade=24 10th Grade=22	60% of all students will score above proficiency (Levels 4-5) in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing the necessary rigor to challenge and the students at this level. Focusing on and determining the text complexity of all materials.	NG-CARPD Trained Trainers on staff Thinking Map Training Gifted Classes Common Core Trainers on staff Benchmark and pacing guide alignment	Principal Reading Coach	Data chats Observations Lesson Plan reviews Data review	FAIR Assessments ThinkLink Assessments Class Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Increase the number of students who score an achievement level of 7 or above on the FAA.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2/5 students taking the FAA scored at or above a level 7.	4/5 students taking the FAA will score at or above a level 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	Staff to student ratio, and meeting all students' individual needs.	Increase the number of staff who are involved with this subgroup	Principal	Observations 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment data review	2012 Florida Alternative 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT reading by 17%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% of students tested made learning gains in reading	60% of students will make Learning Gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	FCAT 2.0 Text complexity Beginning the process of common core implementation and time restraints	Teachers will analyze the item specifications for the FCAT 2.0 and increase the text complexity in their instruction. Curriculum alignment Text complexity and common core professional development on campus	Principal Reading Coach	Data review Observations Lesson plan reviews Teacher created assessments turned in with lesson plans Departmental Planning days	FAIR Assessment ThinkLink Assessment Administrative review of lessons and assessments
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 group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	NS Not enough information or number of students tested to calculate a score
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NS Not enough information or number of students tested to calculate a score	Increase scores and number of students making learning gains

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:	Increase the percentage of students in Lowest quartile making learning gains in FCAT reading by 17%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% of lowest quartile students made learning gains in reading	60% of students in lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Building student endurance and increasing motivation to learn.	Plugged in to Nonfiction Program to increase engagement and motivation with high interest readings. Classroom assessments will be adapted to mirror	Principal Reading Coach	Data review Observations Lesson plan reviews Teacher created assessments turned in with lesson plans	FAIR Assessment ThinkLink Assessment Administrative review of lessons and assessments

	the FCAT 2.0 Curriculum Alignment with FCAT 2.0 Scaffolding approach	
--	--	--

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 #					
	It is our goal here at Union County High School, to close the achievement gap each year. Our goal is by the 2016-2017 school year, 100% of the students will be proficient in reading.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53	59	63	67	71	

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:	Increase the percentage of students in the following subgroups, who make learning gains in reading, on the FCAT 2.0 by 20% in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 9th Grade=57; 10th Grade=57 Black: 9th Grade=14; 10th Grade=24 Economically Disadvantaged: 9th Grade=40; 10th Grade=43	White: 9th Grade=77; 10th Grade=77 Black: 9th Grade=34; 10th Grade=44 Economically Disadvantaged: 9th Grade=60; 10th Grade=63

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	Increasing motivation and accountability in the students.	Faculty members that sponsor clubs or elective classes will make a connection with these students and give encouragement and motivation. Teachers will analyze the item specifications for the FCAT 2.0 and increase the text complexity in their instruction. Curriculum alignment Text complexity and common core professional development on campus Thinking Maps	Principal Reading Coach	Data review Observations Lesson plan reviews Progress chats Departmental Planning Days	FAIR Assessment ThinkLink Assessment Administrative review of lessons and assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	NA-No data reported when fewer than 10 students were tested.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA-No data reported when fewer than 10 students were tested.		NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	NA-No data reported when fewer than 10 students were tested.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA-No data reported when fewer than 10 students were tested.	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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the number of students in the subgroups that are successful in making learning gains in reading by 20%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above grade level Grade9=40; Grade10=43	60% of Economically Disadvantaged students will score at or above grade level in reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0.

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
	Motivation and accountability of the students	Faculty members that sponsor clubs or elective classes will make a connection with these students and give encouragement and motivation. Teachers will analyze the	Principal Reading Coach Club Sponsors	Data review Observations Lesson plan reviews Progress chats Departmental Planning Days	FAIR Assessment ThinkLink Assessment Classroom Assessments

1		item specifications for the FCAT 2.0 and increase the text complexity in their instruction. Curriculum alignment Text complexity and common core professional development on campus Thinking Maps		
---	--	--	--	--

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 to analyze data from continued progress monitoring instruments	9-12	Key school staff	Reading and English teachers	Monthly	Planned department meetings to discuss data and strategies needed	Reading Coach

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
Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$7,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Standards alignment		Grant money	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
			Grand Total: \$12,500.00

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:				
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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics 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 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:

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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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%.		Mathematics Goal # Increase student achievement by 3% each year.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	58	67	70	73	77	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
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:

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

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:				
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:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:				
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				

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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.				
Algebra 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				

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				

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
Department planning days	Think Link data Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$5,000.00

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:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring				

at or above Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.		Increase the percent of students proficient on the state science assessment.			
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
30% (36) students scored level 3 on the 11th grade science FCAT.		50% or more of the students will score proficiency on the state assessment test for Science (Biology EOC)			
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	Focusing on the assessed standards and formulating a pacing guide to cover the material in a timely fashion with mastery	Provide instruction and planning time to develop pacing guide instruction and mastery of the material	Teachers, Administration, Academic Coaches	Progress Monitoring and teacher created assessments.	Progress Monitoring assessments, teacher created assessments and Biology EOC exam

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:					
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:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		To increase the number of students scoring 3.0 and higher on the FCAT Writes, and meet the Annual Measurable Objective for this subgroup in 2012-2013.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
89% (125/141) of the 10th grade students scored a 3.0 or above on the 2011-2012 FCAT Writes.		95% of 10th grade students will make a 3.0 or higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT Writes, and meet the Annual Measurable Objective..			
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	Maintaining student achievement levels.	Teacher modeled strategies and monthly writing prompts.	Administration Reading Coach 10th grade English Teachers	Monitor with classroom observations and essay prompt scoring from rubrics.	Grades from Write Score Company Progress monitoring through essay prompt scores and observation.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:		Maintain the percentage of students who score at or above a 4 in writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
100% of the students scored a 4 or higher on the FAA. (3/3)		Maintain 100% of the students scoring a 4 or higher on the FAA.			
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

U.S. History 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

No Data Submitted

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase the attendance rate				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
89% is the current attendance rate (635)	93% will be the expected attendance rate for 2012-2013				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
In 2012, 521 of 635, UCHS students had excessive absences.	In 2013, only 50% of UCHS students will demonstrate excessive absences				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
In 2012, 5 students had excessive tardies	In 2013, 2 students will demonstrate excessive tardies				
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					

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Decrease the number of Suspensions by increasing the level of PBS implementation
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
192 In-School Suspensions	150 In-School Suspension
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
192 Students were suspended in school 2009-2011 school year	150 students suspended in school for the 2010-2012 school year
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

69 Out of school suspensions	50 Out of school suspensions				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
69 Out of school suspension and expulsions	50 Out of school suspension and expulsions				
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	Home Life Situation	Stress the importance of education	Counselors, Teachers, and administrators	Tracking of attendance through skyward	Attendance Rate
2	Teen Pregnancy	Stress the importance of education, family life, teach abstinence through Health and Health Occupations classes	Counselors, teachers, and administrators	Health Occupations, School Nurse, Health Teacher, Teachers and Counselor discussions	Attendance Rate

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>			Our dropout rate for the 2010-2011 school year was 1.2%. The 2011-2012 rate is still pending from the state.		
2012 Current Dropout Rate:			2013 Expected Dropout Rate:		
Pending state release of data on current dropout rate			Pending state release of data		
2012 Current Graduation Rate:			2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
Pending state release of data			Pending state release of data		
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 expected their child to work to support the family	Stress the importance of receiving an education.	Counselors, administrators, teachers	monthly meetings on programs	graduation rate
2	Lack of motivation	Blue Ridge Step Up	Counselors, administrators, teachers	newsletters, call-outs, newspaper, parent meetings	graduation rate

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

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:		Increase the percentage of parental involvement			
*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:			
27% parental involvement		35% parental 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
	Lack of transportation and technology. Some parents work schedule doesn't allow involvement and students don't	Advertise public computers at the public library. Local radio advertisements, local paper advertisements and articles,	School officials, Krystal Gunter, Athletic Coaches and Extracurricular programs	Volunteer sign in sheets are collected by sponsors and turned into volunteer coordinator	Percentage will increase from 27% to 35%.

1	communicate with parents.	newsletters sent home weekly, newsletters posted on the website and through email along with daily announcements. Promote community effort to be all inclusive. i.e. family, church, school staff, students, 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 Goal #1:	To increase student achievement in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math in a systemic and collaborative effort that develops connections between standards-based instruction and improved teacher effectiveness. This improvement will lead to proficient and productive teachers and students.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing planning opportunities for various teachers.	Provide additional planning time for collaborative efforts between teachers during and after school hours.	Administration, CTE, Math, and Science teachers	Implementation of cross content planning through lesson plans that include Common Core Standards in Science and Math.	Pre and post tests and assessment tools to determine depth of knowledge gained.

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
BRIDGES / STEM workshops	9-12	NEFEC	Science and Math Teachers	Ongoing	BioTechnology Lab	CTE, Math, and Science teachers, Administrations

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
Obtaining materials and information	UF Technology Lab	N/A	\$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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			Increase the number of industry certification gained by students by 10%.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling students into CTE classes	Use of on-line base courses to open space to resolve scheduling issues.	Guidance	Greater numbers in industry certification based CTE courses and more students passing the tests.	State industry certification exams

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
Attend FACTE meetings to learn more about programs and certifications	9-12	FACTE and FLDOE	9-12 CTE teachers and Bradford Union Area Career Technical Center	On-going	Reports including numbers in CTE courses and industry certification exam scores	Administration, Guidance, CTE teachers.

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
Increase certification to include Quickbooks	Quickbook Software	Technology monies	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
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: \$1,500.00

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
STEM	Obtaining materials and information	UF Technology Lab	N/A	\$0.00
CTE	Increase certification to include Quickbooks	Quickbook Software	Technology monies	\$1,500.00
				Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Reading	Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Reading	Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Reading	Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Reading	Department Planning Days	Think Link Data and pacing guides Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$1,500.00
Mathematics	Department planning days	Think Link data Substitute teachers	Payroll	\$5,000.00
				Subtotal: \$12,500.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Standards alginment		Grant money	\$5,000.00
				Subtotal: \$5,000.00
				Grand Total: \$19,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 11/1/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the

statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
There are no plans to spend the limited funds of the SAC at this time.	\$370.00

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

The Union County High School SAC will continue to provide after school tutoring opportunities for the math students at the high school through its student led program. SAC members will help chaperone the tutoring sessions and will host training for the students who will be providing the tutoring. The SAC will also sponsor age and topic appropriate guest speakers for the students when time allows. SAC members also provide volunteer time during special events when needed (i.e. proctoring large test administrations, help during career fair, etc).

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

Union School District UNION COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	42%	71%	87%	40%	240	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	43%	70%			113	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?	42% (NO)	57% (YES)			99	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					462	
Percent Tested = 94%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Union School District UNION COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	46%	76%	89%	38%	249	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	48%	70%			118	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?	37% (NO)	52% (YES)			89	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					456	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested