

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Pam Stewart, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: David LaRosa

SAC Chair: Mr. Richard Tanner

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 12/6/2012

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	David LaRosa	BA-Secondary ED, MA-Ed Leadership Ed Leadership & School Principal (All levels) PE (6-12) Social Science (6-12)	7	8	Principal of Fort Myers High 2007-2011 2011 Grade A 2010 Grade: B 2009 Grade: A 2008 Grade: B 2007 Grade: A 2006: Principal of Alternative Learning Center: School Grade not issued
Assis Principal	Dr. Michelle Cort-Mora	BS – Computer Engineering; MBA Finance, Ed Specialist School Admin., Ed.D Ed. Leadership Argosy University School Principal (all levels) Business (6-12) Ed Leadership	4	9	Assistant Principal Fort Myers High 2008-2012 2011 Grade A 2010 Grade: B 2009 Grade: A District Level Administrator, Human Resources 2004 - 2008

		(All levels)			
Assis Principal	Trent Eckhardt	BS – History; MS - Ed Leadership School Principal and Ed. Leadership (All levels) Social Science (5-9 & 9-12)	7	12	Assistant Principal Fort Myers High 2005-2012 2011 Grade A 2010 Grade: B 2009 Grade: A 2008: Grade: B 2007 Grade: A 2006 Grade: A 2005 Grade: A Assistant Principal, East Naples Middle School 2001 - 2004
Assis Principal	Elmer Stewart	BS-Science MA-Ed Leadership Ed Leadership (All levels) Physics (6-12) Chemistry (6-12)	2	2	Assistant Principal 2010-2012 2011 Grade A
Assis Principal	Laura Stanford	BA English Literature M.Ed in Educational Leadership English (6-12) Educational Leadership	1	1	Assistant Principal 2012-2013

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	Heidi Van Waus	B.S in Primary Education Reading and ESOL endorsed	2	2	
Reading	Joyce Baskin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelors in Elementary Education K-6 • ESOL Endorsed K-12 • Reading Endorsed Grades K-12 • Masters Ed Leadership all capacities 	3	8	

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal and teacher leaders.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff	Peer Teacher	Ongoing	
3	3. Yearly professional development training focused on areas of need to achieve higher student performance levels.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. New Teacher Mentoring via the use of Blackboard	Assistant 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]).

<p>Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.</p>	<p>Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective</p>
<p>There are 2 teachers listed as not effective, 2 teachers out of field in a content area. 3 teachers out of field ESOL</p>	<p>1) Attend CAR-PD training and implement strategies in your classroom. 2) Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development. 3) Meet with assigned mentor every two weeks to discuss your students' achievement data and strategies to assist students. 4) Meet with designated Assistant Principal monthly to review your students' grades and to report to him your progress toward increasing the number of students who are earning at least a C.</p>

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
103	7.8%(8)	14.6%(15)	26.2%(27)	50.5%(52)	41.7%(43)	89.3%(92)	10.7%(11)	7.8%(8)	24.3%(25)

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
Debra Atkins	Shawn French	ESE Dept. Head, IEP Training	Methods, IEP's, Curriculum
Chris Drake	David Burns	Common subject, experienced in our school	Scheduling, Planning
Johanna Shanks	Marie Aulino	Foreign Language Department Head	Methods of Teaching, Content
Cathy Tucker	Luke Russell	Common Subject, Experienced in our school	Methods of Teaching
Russell Sousa	Scott Robinson	Experienced Mentor	Planning & Scheduling Trainings
Kelly Heinzman-Britton	Carly Miller	Experienced Mentor, former science teacher, good with classroom	Methods and Information

Kathy Himes	Rachael Sikkenga	management Common Subject, Excellent with planning and course timeline.	Methods of Teaching
-------------	------------------	---	---------------------

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI Leadership Team for Fort Myers High consists of the following members:

Trent Eckhardt-Assistant Principal
Patti Elkin-Guidance Counselor
Maricela Ferras-ESOL contact
Miriam Thiele-School Psychologist
Patricia Weekley-ESE teacher
HeidiVanWaus-Reading teacher
Mary Ellen Schultz-Mathematics teacher
Trent Eckhardt-Assistant Principal
Nicole Depuy-Speech Pathologist
Ron Strine-Social Worker
Laura Stanford-Assistant Principal

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 RtI Leadership team at Fort Myers High meets on an as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a RTI folder (curriculum assessments, FAIR, Language! Placement test, FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing

- Attend RTI Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by RTI Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend RTI Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Implement Tier 2 & 3 interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotes of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend RTI Team meetings for some Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with Tier 2 & 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

Principal/Assistant Principal

- Facilitate implementation of RTI in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support RTI implementation when possible
- Attend RTI Team meetings to be active in the RTI change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- Often RTI Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend RTI Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary RTI forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

School Psychologist

- Attend RTI Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 & on all students in Tier 3
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review & interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with RTI Team on effective instruction & specific interventions

- Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible ESE referral & when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with RTI Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate RTI data when making eligibility decisions

Social Worker

- Attend RTI Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with RTI Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all RTI Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments

Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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 RtI Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

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.

Fort Myers High School utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RtI process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RtI process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Trent Eckhardt – Assistant Principal
 Michelle Cort-Mora – Assistant Principal
 Susan Barnes – Reading Teacher
 Heidi Van Waus – Reading Coach
 Joyce Baskin – Reading Coach
 Maricela Ferra – ESOL contact
 Luke Russell - Science Teacher
 Leonard Kozel - History Teacher
 Mary Ellen Schultz – Math Teacher
 Rachel Sikkenga - English Teacher
 Tami Farrell - Reading Teacher
 Colleen Tenfelde - Reading Teacher

Julie Rose - Math Teacher
Ron Riis - English Teacher

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

The LLT meets three times a year, at the beginning of each semester and at the end of the year. Most member communication is via e-mail and this is done about once a week year round. At organizational meetings, duties related to the projects are accepted by volunteers on the team. Susan Barnes takes the minutes of the meetings and distributes them to team members. Heidi Van Waus sets up meetings and communicates to team members.

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

The Reading Leadership Team will concentrate this year on increasing awareness and use of online resources in the media center by both teachers and students at all reading levels. Four in-services will be offered to assign some of the thousands of articles available in all content areas.

They are trying to get the students to research in other ways than just looking on google for all of their information.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Our school-wide reading strategy for the last three year have been the implementation of Tier III Word Walls in all classrooms. Also, we have SAT words of the week which are integrated into all subject area curriculums. Reading Coach is going into different subject classes modeling Anticipation Guides and Reading Around the Text. The Reading Coach is also working with the new teachers with word walls and other strategies through the APPLS program.

*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?

Freshmen are placed in either a freshmen success orientation course through the business department or are enrolled in a Center for the Arts program. The freshmen success course (Introduction into Information Technology) is actually three-fold. It gives students practical computer applications, expensive study of career interests, but also explains how students may access vocational opportunities like the Gold Seal scholarship or through industry certifications. Students enrolled in the Center for the Arts program may study a total of ten high school credits with the focus on development of skills and experiences that may allow them access into post-secondary study in their area of concentration.

Students have a minimum of two planning sessions with their guidance counselor during their freshmen year to develop goals for their future coursework and career plans.

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?

Students, parents and counselors meet twice annually to address academic goals and career planning. Students complete an

individual education plan and are encouraged to take interest based elective courses. During registration for the following year's classes, students are assisted by homeroom teachers to select appropriate levels of courses, students then take these selection home to parents for review and input. Students have individual appointments with their guidance counselor to discuss their choices and options to ensure it is adhering to the educational plan.

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](#)

The school's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum, enrolled in Algebra I course before 9th grade, completed at least one level 3 high school math course, and completed a Dual Enrollment (DE) math course were meeting the district averages. Many of these areas are above the state average, but the school is focused on creating a greater emphasis on math preparedness. We will also encourage students to take AP, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans. This will include sharing information and requirements to become eligible for Bright Futures. A guidance counselor is stationed daily in all lunch shifts to ensure maximum student access to information regarding careers, testing dates, educational options, scheduling and referral to other agencies or services. Different colleges and universities visit the campus weekly and are set-up in a permanent space in our cafeteria called "College Corner" during lunch shifts.

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:	In 2012, 78% of students scored at or above grade level in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 78% of students scored at or above grade level in reading.	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in reading will increase from 78% to 80%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student comprehension of advanced text	Implement the new FAIR assessments to monitor student progress Incorporate higher-order thinking questions in lesson plans Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading and Language Arts classes Organize a Reading Leadership Team	Principal Assistant Principals Teachers Reading Coach	Review of FAIR data reports Monitor effectiveness during classroom walk-throughs Analysis of student performance data	FAIR Assessments Classroom walk-through log FCAT score reports EOC Scores

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Student disabilities	Teachers will follow each student's IEP and provide accommodations as needed.	Principal Assistant Principals Guidance Counselors ESE Teachers ESE Paraprofessionals Content Area Teachers Reading Coach	Classroom Assessments IEP Meetings Parent Feedback Student Achievement FAA Scores	Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA)
---	----------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

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:	55% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading in 2012.	59% of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading in 2013.

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	Level 4-5 students may struggle with more challenging texts, vocabulary, and higher order thinking skills.	Incorporate higher-order thinking skills across the curriculum Implement a vocabulary development plan Introduce high-level, complex texts Incorporate teacher modeling of reading strategies and high-order cognitive skills.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach Teachers Paraprofessionals	Classroom walk-throughs Classroom Assessments Checking Teacher Lesson Plans Following up with Department Heads.	FCAT 2.0 Classroom Assessments and Grades Student Portfolios

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:	50% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading in 2012.	54% of students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Disabilities	Follow each student's IEP Teachers will provide accommodations where applicable	Principal Assistant Principals Teachers Reading Coach ESE Teachers ESE Paraprofessionals	Classroom Walk-throughs IEP Meetings Parent Feedback Student Grades	Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA)

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:	68% of students made learning gains in reading in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% of students made learning gains in reading in 2012.	71% of students will make learning gains in reading in 2013.

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	Level 1-2 students may struggle with basic comprehension skills, vocabulary, and higher order thinking skills. Level 3 students may struggle with more challenging texts, comprehension, vocabulary, and higher order thinking skills. Level 4-5 students may struggle with more challenging texts, vocabulary, and higher order thinking skills.	Incorporate higher-order thinking skills across the curriculum Implement a vocabulary development plan Introduce high-level, complex texts, Incorporate teacher modeling of reading strategies and high-order cognitive skills.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach Teachers Paraprofessionals	Classroom walk-throughs Classroom Assessments Checking Teacher Lesson Plans Following up with Department Heads	FCAT 2.0 Classroom Assessments and Grades Student Portfolios

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:	100% of students made learning gains in reading in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

100% of students made learning gains in reading in 2012.

100% of students will make learning gains in reading in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Disabilities	Follow each student's IEP Teachers will provide accommodations where applicable	Principal Assistant Principals Teachers Reading Coach ESE Teachers ESE Paraprofessionals	Classroom Walk-throughs IEP Meetings Parent Feedback Student Grades	Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA)

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.

64% of the lowest quartile students made learning gains in reading in 2012.

Reading Goal #4:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

64% of the lowest quartile students made learning gains in reading in 2012.

67% of the lowest quartile students will make learning gains in reading in 2013.

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	Our lowest 25% includes students that are not required to take reading.	1. Identify those students and give strategies to their teachers. 2. Include higher-order questions in lesson plans. 3. One Book One School program. 4. Reading Leadership Team 5. Extended Day Reading instruction in small group learning environment.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	1. FCAT results 2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walk-throughs. 3. Media Center circulation. 4. Student performance data. 5. Attendance rosters and student performance data.	1. FCAT results 2. Classroom walk-through log and focused walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions. 3. Student portfolio. 4. Destiny reports. 5. Reading assessments.
2	Struggling readers	Implementation of the FAIR assessment	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR Assessments.

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

Reading Goal #

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

5A : In 2012, 78% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading. By the 2016-2017 school year, 88% of students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78%	80%	82%	84%	86%	

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:	In 2012, 38% of Black students and 71% of Hispanic students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 38% of Black Students and 71% Hispanic students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.	In 2013, 43% of Black students and 74% of Hispanic students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 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	Level 1 readers' comprehension of advanced text.	The school will implement the new FAIR assessments to monitor student progress. Include higher-order questions in lesson plans. Develop an Instruction Focus Calendar for Reading and Language Arts classes. One Book One School program. Reading Leadership Team. Extended Day Reading instruction in small group learning environment.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading and Language Arts Chairs, Reading Coach	Review FAIR data reports. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs. Media Center circulation. Student performance data. Attendance rosters and student performance data	FAIR Assessments. Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of higher order questions. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR assessments. Destiny reports Reading Assessments.
2	ESE and ESOL students comfort level with testing on the Computer.	Students will practice on the EPAT to improve their test taking skills on the computer.	Teachers, Test coordinator, Reading Coach	Monitor all classes progress of getting everyone tested on the EPAT before the FCAT.	EPAT
3	ESOL students will receive extra help with a language dictionary.	Students will have an ESOL mentor work with them on subject area tests.	ESOL coordinator, Teachers, APA	Monitor student progress following mentoring.	Report cards, interim grades. Classroom test scores.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	0% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in reading in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in reading in 2012.	100% of ELL students will make satisfactory gains in reading in 2013.
---	---

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	Limited English Proficiency, Monolingual students	<p>Include English as a Second Language (ESOL) strategies in all classrooms that contain ELL/LEP students.</p> <p>Ensure all teachers have completed the required ESOL training or are making adequate progress in obtaining an ESOL endorsement.</p>	Principal, Assistant Principals, Teachers, Reading Coach	Classroom Walk-throughs, Language Testing	FCAT Student Assessment Data Report Cards Interim Reports

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:	38% of students with disabilities (SWD) scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading in 2012. 100% of SWD made learning gains on the FAA in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% of students with disabilities (SWD) scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading in 2012. 100% of SWD made learning gains on the FAA in 2012.	43% of students with disabilities (SWD) will score at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Disabilities	Teachers will uphold each student's IEP and provide accommodations as needed.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Teachers, ESE Teachers, ESE Paraprofessionals	Classroom Walk-Throughs, Classroom Assessment, IEP Meetings, Parent Feedback	FAA

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:	In 2012, 57% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 57% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.	In 2013, 61% of Economically Disadvantaged students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 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	Student comprehension of advanced text.	<p>The school will implement the new FAIR assessments to monitor student progress.</p> <p>Include higher-order questions in lesson plans.</p> <p>Develop an Instruction Focus Calendar for Reading and Language Arts classes.</p> <p>One Book One School program.</p> <p>Reading Leadership Team.</p> <p>Extended Day Reading instruction in small group learning environment.</p>	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading and Language Arts Chairs, Reading Coach	<p>Review FAIR data reports.</p> <p>Classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>Media Center circulation.</p> <p>Student performance data.</p> <p>Attendance rosters and student performance data.</p>	<p>FAIR Assessments.</p> <p>Classroom walk-through log and focused walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions.</p> <p>FAIR assessments.</p> <p>Destiny reports.</p> <p>Reading Assessments.</p>

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
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	Reading Teachers	Reading Coach Administrators	All Reading teachers	30 minute staff development	Meet with assigned mentor every two weeks to discuss your students' achievement data and strategies to assist students	Administrators

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Extended day reading instruction in small groups	Supplemental contracts	SIP	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Rwading Leadership	International Reading Association Conference	Title II	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:			In 2012-2013 students CELLA scores will increase to 45% which is 3% over previous year's score. Th		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
In 2011-2012 students at Fort Myers High School showed 42% proficiency in the CELLA test total score.					
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 students' level of comprehension of the English language	ESOL support in the classroom, support by ESOL endorsed teachers, use of bilingual dictionaries	Teachers, ESOL support, Administration	Monitor students grades, consultation with teachers	Standardized test

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:			In 2012-2013 students CELLA scores will increase to 19% which is 3% over previous year's score.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
In 2011-2012 CELLA students had a 16% proficiency rate					
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	Familiarity with the english language	FCAT Explorer Empower 3000 Rosetta Stone	Reading Teachers, Administrators	CELLA Practice test	Cella test
2		Lingustic presentations, fishbones, Venn	ELL teacher, classroom teacher	CELLA test	Cella test

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

In 2012-2013 students CELLA scores will increase in writing to 32% which is 3% over previous year's score.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2011-2012 CELLA proficiency in Writing was 29%

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	Proficiency in language	Round Table Radio Reader Echo Reading Circle of friends	ELL teacher	CELLA Scores	Cella Scores

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:	No FAA goal is necessary, as there are too few students taking FAA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	No FAA goal is necessary, as there are too few students taking FAA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	No FAA goal is necessary, as there are too few students taking FAA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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 #				
		5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	In 2010-2011 52% of black students and 29% of hispanic students did not achieve a Level 3 on FCAT.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
In 2012 38% of black students and 13 percent of hispanic students did not achieve Level 3 as reported by AYP	In 2012-2013 the number of black and hispanic students not achieving Level 3 will decrease by at least 5% in each subgroup.				
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	Attendance Issues	Liberal Arts Math Class offered	Teachers, Administrators	Process document	EOC
2	Time Frame of Testing window	Tutoring After school	Teachers and Administrators	Strategies designed to achieve each measurable objective within the given timeline	Review of data

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	No data available
--	-------------------

Mathematics Goal #5C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	No data available			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In 2012 38% of Black students and 13% of Hispanic students did not achieve Level 3.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
In 2012 38% of Black students and 13% of Hispanic students did not achieve Level 3.	In 2012-2013 the number of Black and Hispanic students not achieving Level 3 will decrease by at least 5% in each subgroup.				
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	Attendance Issues	Liberal Arts Math Class offered	Teachers and Administrators	Process document	EOC
2	Time Frame of the testing window	Tutoring Afterschool	Teachers and Administrators	Strategies designed to achieve each measurable objective within the given timeline.	Review of data

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:	In 2011-2012, 58% of all students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, 58% of all students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	In 2013, 62% of all students taking Algebra I, will score at or above Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I 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	Proficiency of students who come from various middle schools	Reduce class size	Teachers, administrators	Action-oriented meetings	End-of-course Examination (EOC)
2	Computer vs pencil test	Technology integration in classroom	Teacher, Tech Spec, Administration	Constant Reflection	EOC 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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	No data available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 2011-2012 we had a total of 573 students take the EOC in Geometry. Of the 573, 364 passed with a level 3 or higher. (64%)		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
In 2011-2012 we had a total of 573 students take the EOC in Geometry. Of the 573, 364 passed with a level 3 or higher. (64%)		In 2012-2013 67% of students taking Geometry this school year will score a Level 3 or higher on the Geometry End of Course math exam		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	Math Department	Math Dept Head	Common Core Standards, EOC's	monthly dept meetings	Dept discussions	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Extended day mathematics instruction in small groups	Supplemental contracts	SIP	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Computers for FCAT Explorer practice	Computer Hardware	Tech Refresh	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
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: \$6,500.00

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:	In 2011-2012 100% of students tested received a score of Level 4,5 and 6 in science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 100% of students tested received a score of Level 4,5 and 6 in science	In 2012-2013 100% of students tested will receive a score of Level 4,5 and 6 in science
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time for course study is limited. Need extended windows for CCE's and EOC's. ESE and ESOL understanding of subject matter and testing technology.	Development of standard scoring rubrics for the science classroom. Teachers continue on with rigorous academic standards. ESE inclusion students will be provided with extended time for test completion. ESOL students will use language dictionaries when necessary.	Principal, Assistant Principals, Teachers, ESOL contact and Interpreter, ESE teachers	Percentage of labs and interactive activities will increase. CCE scores will increase throughout the school year, leading to the EOC exam Take baseline test and then continue to monitor work throughout the year.	Sharepoint, Lessonplans, Walkthroughs, Grades Achievement Series Data, Baseline Data, EOC data Interim, test grades, report cards

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:	No FAA goal is necessary, as there are too few students taking FAA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 2011-12, Fort Myers High students will achieve a 70% or better on their End of Course science exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-12, 39% of all Fort Myers High students achieved a Level 3 or better on their End of Course Science Exam.	In 2012-13, 44% Fort Myers High students will achieve a Level 3 or better on their End of Course Science 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	The Science assessment impacts the school grade but is not a graduation requirement for the student.	Development of standard scoring rubrics for the science classroom	Science teacher	Percentage of labs completed will increase	Sharepoint Lesson Plans, Walk-throughs, Grades.
2	Time for course study. Extended windows for CCE's and EOC's.	Teachers continue on district timeline with rigorous academic standards.	Teacher, Principal, AP's	CCE scores will increase throughout the school year leading to EOC Exam.	Achievement Series Data, Baseline Data
3	ESE and ESOL understanding of subject matter.	ESE inclusion students will get extended time to do tests and ESOL students will use language dictionaries when necessary.	Teacher, ESOL Contact and Interpreter, ESE teachers	Take baseline test and then continue to monitor work throughout the year.	Interims, test grades, report cards.
4	Time for course study is limited. Need extended windows for CCE's and EOC's. ESE and ESOL understanding of subject matter and testing technology.	Development of standard scoring rubrics for the science classroom. Teachers continue on with rigorous academic standards. ESE inclusion students will get extended time to do tests and ESOL students will use language dictionaries when necessary.	science teacher Teacher, principal, AP's Teacher, ESOL contact and Interpreter, ESE teachers	Percentage of labs and interactive activities will increase. CCE scores will increase throughout the school year leading to the EOC exam Take Baseline test and then continue to monitor work throughout the year.	Sharepoint, Lessonplans, Walkthroughs, Grades Achievement Series Data, Baseline Data, EOC data Interim, test grades, report cards

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				

(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
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	Science Department	Department Head	Science teachers	Monthly Science Meetings	Minutes	Administrators

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:	In 2011-2012, 95% of 10th grade students scored at or above level 3 on the FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, 95% of students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Writes.	In 2012-2013, 97% of 10th grade students will score at or above level 3 on the FCAT Writes.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not enough classroom time for formative feedback	1. Common Planning 2. Professional learning communities	Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Classroom teachers	master schedule, Department meeting minutes	Master schedule, department meeting minutes.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	All levels	Writing teachers	All teachers	Monthly	Minutes	Administrators

Writing Budget:

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:		NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Due to the fact that this is the first time the exam is being offered. No prior data is available		In 2012-2013 school year, Fort Myers High students will achieve a score that is 3% higher than the district's average on the U.S History 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
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
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	History teachers	History Department head	Department wide	Monthly meetings	minutes	Administration

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

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:				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
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
Actively participate in our school's Professional Learning Community, including our weekly 30 minutes of Professional Development	English teachers	Teachers	Monthly dept meetings	on going	Student work samples	Administration

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:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

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
PBS school	all teachers welcome	PBS leader	Teachers discuss positive behavior strategies to support students who have difficulty controlling their behavior	Monthly meeting	Each month teachers bring feedback to the team	ALL

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>	For school year 2011-12, the graduation rate for FMHS was 97.5% and the dropout rate did not exceed 1%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
For school year 2011-12, the graduation rate for FMHS was 97.5% and the dropout rate did not exceed 1%.	In school year 2012-13, the graduation rate for FMHS will be 98% and the dropout rate will not exceed 1%.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
97%	In school year 2012-13, the graduation rate at FMHS will increase to 98% and the dropout rate will not exceed 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	Students behind several credits.	Students will enroll in the E2020 credit retrieval program.	Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, Classroom Instructor	Student contracts	Completed contracts
2					
3					

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
Determining our students who are at risk	10-12th graders	Admin, counselors	School wide inservice on how to recognize a student who may be at risk of dropping out	Fall, spring	Checking with subject area teachers for progress monitoring	Administrators

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	In 2011-12, parent participation in meetings and/or activities on the school campus will increase from 52% to 56% as reflected in meeting sign-in sheets and volunteer database.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2011-12, parent participation in meetings and/or activities on the school campus was 56% as reflected in meeting sign-in sheets and volunteer database	In 2012-13, parent participation in meetings and/or activities on the school campus will increase to 58% as reflected in meeting sign-in sheets and volunteer database.

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 informed of events	1. A ParentLink message will be sent via phone and e-mail 2. Quarterly newsletter	Technology Specialist, activity sponsors, Principal, Activity Director	Survey	Parent, Staff, and teacher survey, sign-in sheets, volunteer database
2	Calendar of sporting events and important dates, tests.	School Website	Staff and student website coordinators	AP's continually checking website to make sure it is up to date.	FMHS Website check every week.
3	How to monitor number of volunteers.	Create a computer program for all volunteers to be tracked.	Receptionist that signs volunteers in.	AP monitors the database.	Check on number of hours each quarter and send to district for checks at semester.

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
PBS school	all teachers welcome	PBS leader	Teachers discuss positive behavior strategies to support students who have difficulty controlling their behavior or attending school	Monthly meeting	Each month teachers bring feedback to the team	All

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Quarterly Newsletter	Printing of newsletter	SIP	\$1,350.00
Freshman Registration	Counselors, parents, administration	SIP	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$4,850.00
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: \$4,850.00

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:	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

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	In 2012-2013 Industry Certifications in Photoshop, MOS,

CTE Goal #1:		Quickbooks, SolidWorks and CIW certifications will increase by at least 10% from the 2011-2012 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
1	Testing Lab/Coordinator	Develop a plan for consistent lab testing schedule. Contact other local schools to research best testing practices.	CTE teachers, Administrators	Accurate Data Collection	Data Sheets accurately submitted to district office in a timely manner.
2	Teacher Certifications	Teacher training through Lee County School District Professional Development. Teacher training within career and tech department at FMHS.	CTE teacher, Administrators	Teachers pass Industry Certification Test	Less class interruptions and more class time.
3					

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
Work with CTE coordinator downtown	all levels	Department Head	Teachers will work on strategies to increase student success rate on Industry certification	Monthly	Students test weekly, data collected	Administration

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)

I B Goal Goal:

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. I B Goal Goal I B Goal Goal #1:		The percentage of students earning the IB diploma will increase from 54.6 to 60% in 2013 according to the IBO assessment report.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
54.6% of IB students earned their IB diploma in 2011-2012.		In 2012-2013, 60% of students will earn their IB diploma.			
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	Preparedness of students.	Progress monitoring	Teachers, administrators	Test results from IB classes	IB exam

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

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

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

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
IB updates on curriculum	IB training	IB funds	\$6,000.00
			Subtotal: \$6,000.00
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: \$6,000.00

End of I B Goal Goal(s)

AP Testing Goal:

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. AP Testing Goal AP Testing Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of students passing the AP exam was 54% according to the AP Report.			
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:			
In 2011-2012 the percentage of students passing the AP exam was 54% according to the AP Report.	In 2012-2013 the percentage of students passing the AP exam will increase to 59% . Note: This is a 5% increase based on the average of the last 5 years.			
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						

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 AP Testing Goal(s)

Anti-Bullying Goal:

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. Anti-Bullying Goal Anti-Bullying Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 the total number of Bullying incidents were 5.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
In 2011-2012 the total number of Bullying incidents were 5.	In 2012-2013 the total number of Bullying incidents will decrease by at least 20% which will be 4 incidents or less.

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 awareness of what constitutes bullying	Staff will complete District on-line Bullying in-service	Administration	Each staff member will submit a certificate of completion for the Bullying training	In-Service records
2	Students comfort with reporting Incidences of Bullying.	Administration will address Bullying in Opening address to students.	All staff	Review Bullying reports to see if students are reporting.	Analysis of student discipline referrals at the end of year.
3	Use of SocialMedia and Electronic devices in Bullying situations.	Students and parents will be informed about the danger	Administration and teachers	Review of Discipline Referrals to see if a new goal is met and wheter social media was a factor	Analysis of student discipline referrals at the end of year.

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Anti-Bullying Goal(s)

NEA Goal:

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. NEA Goal NEA Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year, the faculty at FMHS will increase the use of data walls as a source of tracking student data.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
in 2011-2012 school year, 55% of the faculty had data walls specific to subject area goals.	During the 2012-2013 school year, 75% of the faculty will have data walls specific to subject area goals.
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						

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

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Extended day reading instruction in small groups	Supplemental contracts	SIP	\$1,500.00
Mathematics	Extended day mathematics instruction in small groups	Supplemental contracts	SIP	\$1,500.00
Parent Involvement	Quarterly Newsletter	Printing of newsletter	SIP	\$1,350.00
Parent Involvement	Freshman Registration	Counselors, parents, administration	SIP	\$3,500.00
I B Goal	IB updates on curriculum	IB training	IB funds	\$6,000.00
				Subtotal: \$13,850.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Computers for FCAT Explorer practice	Computer Hardware	Tech Refresh	\$5,000.00
				Subtotal: \$5,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Rwading Leadership	International Reading Association Conference	Title II	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$20,850.00

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 10/21/2012)

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
Production	\$500.00
Freshman Registration(May 2013)	\$3,500.00
Mailing labels for parent newsletter	\$600.00

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

The purpose of the School Advisory Council is to perform the functions that are prescribed by the regulations of the School Board. The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will give advice concerning the annual budget, and will approve the use of the school improvement funds.

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

Lee School District FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	87%	86%	64%	312	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	67%	80%			147	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?	53% (YES)	65% (YES)			118	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					577	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	86%	93%	60%	314	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	63%	75%			138	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?	41% (NO)	57% (YES)			98	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					560	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested