FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: BARRON COLLIER HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Timothy J. Kutz

SAC Chair: Mark Albanese

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/20/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Timothy Kutz	BS in Mathematics; MS in Educational Leadership; State of Florida certification - Educational	5	10	Mr. Kutz has demonstrated a positive performance record as an instructional leader. Based on BCHS school performance data, students meeting standards in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (72%); 2011/12 (72%). Students meeting standards in Math were: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (90%); 2010/11 (92%); 2011/12 (75%). Although percentage increases were noted 2008/09 to 2010/11, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as tests differed. Students met standards in Writing as follows: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (87%); 2010/11 (92%); and 2011/12 (92%). School performance data revealed students making learning gains in Reading as follows: 2008/09 (64%), 2009/10 (65%); 2010/11 (63%); 2011/12 (69%). Students made learning gains in Math as follows: 2008/09 (77%), 2009/10 (80%); 2010/11 (84%); 2011/12 (61%). Again, it is important to note that

		Leadership (all levels); School Principal endorsement			students took the FCAT Math in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as the tests differed. Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (51%), 2009/10 (54%); 2010/11 (51%); 2011/12 (72%) and students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (79%); 2011/12 (45%). Again, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 that resulted in this decline with the two different tests. School grades are based on school performance data and are reported as follows: 2008/09 (A), 2009/10 (A); 2010/11 (A); and 2011/12 (TBD). Mr. Kutz has a positive track record increasing student achievement through effective instructional leadership strategies.
Assis Principal	Carl DeFurio	BA in Social Studies MS in Education Specialist Degree in Educational Admin Certified in New York Social Studies (7-12) Math (7-12) Reading (K-12) Science (7-12) Educ Leadership (K-12) Athletic Coach Certified in Florida Social Studies (6-12) Math (6-9) Educ Leadership (K-12)	28	19	Mr. Defurio has demonstrated a positive performance record as an instructional leader. Based on BCHS school performance data, students meeting standards in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (72%); 2011/12 (72%). Students meeting standards in Math were: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (90%); 2010/11 (92%); 2011/12 (75%). Although percentage increases were noted 2008/09 to 2010/11, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as tests differed. Students met standards in Writing as follows: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (87%); 2010/11 (92%); and 2011/12 (92%). School performance data revealed students making learning gains in Reading as follows: 2008/09 (64%), 2009/10 (65%); 2010/11 (63%); 2011/12 (69%). Students made learning gains in Math as follows: 2008/09 (77%), 2009/10 (80%); 2010/11 (84%); 2011/12 (61%). Again, it is important to note that students took the FCAT Math in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as the tests differed. Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (51%), 2009/10 (54%); 2010/11 (51%); 2011/12 (72%) and students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (79%); 2011/12 (45%). Again, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 that resulted in this decline with the two different tests. School grades are based on school performance data and are reported as follows: 2008/09 (A), 2009/10 (A); 2010/11 (A); and 2011/12 (TBD). Mr. Defurio, AP Curriculum and Instruction, has a positive track record increasing student achievement.
Assis Principal	Mike Richardson	BA in History; MS in Education Leadership; Certification in State of Florida – Educational Leadership (all levels), History (6-12), English (6-12)	30	17	Mr. Richardson has demonstrated a positive performance record as an instructional leader. Based on BCHS school performance data, students meeting standards in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (72%); 2011/12 (72%). Students meeting standards in Math were: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (90%); 2010/11 (92%); 2011/12 (75%). Although percentage increases were noted 2008/09 to 2010/11, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as tests differed. Students met standards in Writing as follows: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (87%); 2010/11 (92%); and 2011/12 (92%). School performance data revealed students making learning gains in Reading as follows: 2008/09 (64%), 2009/10 (65%); 2010/11 (63%); 2011/12 (69%). Students made learning gains in Math as follows: 2008/09 (77%), 2009/10 (80%); 2010/11 (84%); 2011/12 (61%). Again, it is important to note that students took the FCAT Math in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing a decline as the tests differed. Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading

					were as follows: 2008/09 (51%), 2009/10 (54%); 2010/11 (51%); 2011/12 (72%) and students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%); 2010/11 (79%); 2011/12 (45%). Again, it must be noted that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 that resulted in this decline with the two different tests. School grades are based on school performance data and are reported as follows: 2008/09 (A), 2009/10 (A); 2010/11 (A); and 2011/12 (TBD). Mr. Richardson, AP Attendance and Discipline, has a positive track record increasing student achievement especially through PBS/RtI, the Freshmen PRIDE Academy and Student Accountability Board.
Assis Principal	Robert Dawes	Bachelors of Arts in Psychology, University of Central Florida, Masters of Education in Educational Leadership, Florida Gulf Coast University, Certification - State of Florida - Educational Leadership K-12 Certification - State of Florida ESE K-12 Certification - State of Florida social Science - 6 - 12	1	6	Mr. Dawes has demonstrated a positive performance record as an instructional leader at Barron Collier 2008-2010. Based on school performance data, students meeting standards in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%). Based on school performance data, students meeting standards in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (90%).Based on school performance data, students meeting standards in Writing were as follows: 2008/09 (88%), 2009/10 (87%). Based on school performance data, students making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (64%), 2009/10 (65%). Based on school performance data, students making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (77%), 2009/10 (80%).Based on school performance data, students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2008/09 (51%), 2009/10 (54%). Based on school performance data, students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2008/09 (66%), 2009/10 (69%).School grades are based on school performance data, and are reported as follows: 2008/09 (A), 2009/10 (A). Mr. Dawes was an administrator at PRHS in 2010-2012 where students meeting standards in Reading were as follows: 2010/11 (52%); 2011/12 (53%). Based on school performance data, students meeting standards in Math were as follows: 2010/11 (82%); 2011/12 (56%). It is noteworthy that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing this decline as tests differed. Based on school performance data, students meeting standards in Writing were as follows: 2010/11 (81%); 2011/12 (87%). Based on school performance data, students making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2010/11 (54%); 2011/12 (67%). Based on school performance data, students making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2010/11 (79%); 2011/12 (59%). It is noteworthy that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing this decline as tests differed. Based on school performance data, students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading were as follows: 2010/11 (45%); 2011/12 (67%). Based on school performance data, students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math were as follows: 2010/11 (66%); 2011/12 (59%). Again, it is noteworthy that students took the Math FCAT in 2011 and the Algebra EOC in 2012 showing this decline as tests differed. School grades are based on school performance data, are reported as follows: 2010/11 (B); 2011/12 (TBD). Mr. Dawes has a positive track record increasing student achievement through PBS/RtI programs.

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	Elizabeth Ihle	Pursuing a Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, English 6 - 12 Certified, Reading and ESOL Endorsed	1	4	Mrs. Ihle was a part of Everglades City in the capacity of middle school English, science and social studies. She has also taught high school English and been the secondary reading coach. In 2011-2012, EVG earned 63 total points higher than the year prior, resulting in a school grade increase from an F to an anticipated D. In 2010-2011, EVG achieved,82% AYP.The school letter grade is a F. 52% of the lowest quartile made gains in Reading and 40% of the lowest quartile made gains in Math. In 2009-2010, EVG achieved 92% AYP. The school letter grade was a B. 69% of the lowest quartile made gains in Reading and 83% of the lowest quartile made gains in Math. In 2010, EVG achieved 100% AYP. 92% of the lowest quartile made gains in Reading and 100% of the lowest quartile made gains in Math. Currently, Mrs. Ihle is a Secondary District Literacy Support Specialist and the part-time Reading Coach at Barron Collier High School

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. Offer and encourage teacher to attend workshops offered by the district and train-the trainer workshops offered through the school	Administrative Team and Department Chairs	ongoing	
2	2. Early Release Professional Development days and Professional Learning Communities	Administrative Team	Ongoing	
3	3. Assign mentors who are trained and experienced to mentor new teachers.	Mike Richardson	Ongoing	
4	4.Create Professional Learning Communities that strengthen and support collegiality.	Administrative Team and Department Chairs	Ongoing	
5	The District Human Resource hires only highly qualified teachers.	District Human Resources Administrators	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Kathy Tobin (Spanish) Dan Pallante (On-the-Job-Training) William Swats (Earth Space Science)	Teachers are in the process of pursuing necessary certification through testing per job assignment. Teachers listed are certified in other areas in their job assignment but are working towards certification in the subject

	area indicated, seeking and receiving professional development when necessary, and mentoring as needed.

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
96	0.0%(0)	9.4%(9)	42.7%(41)	47.9%(46)	52.1%(50)	99.0%(95)	7.3%(7)	2.1%(2)	95.8%(92)

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
Les Giles	Jonathan Miller	Mentor is Master teacher in Mentees' subject area.	District New teacher Orientation Program, including presentations on classroom management. RtI, Instructional Strategies, Differentiated Instruction, CTEM, Ethics and Sexual Harassment, in addition to District mentor Mentee meetings
Lucia Garcia	Sage Maucelli	Mentor is Master teacher in Mentees' subject area.	District New teacher Orientation Program, including presentations on classroom management. RtI, Instructional Strategies, Differentiated Instruction, CTEM, Ethics and Sexual Harassment, in addition to District mentor Mentee meetings
Sarah Van Gemert	Carla Decker	Mentor is Master teacher in Mentees' subject area.	District New teacher Orientation Program, including presentations on classroom management. RtI, Instructional Strategies, Differentiated Instruction, CTEM, Ethics and Sexual Harassment, in addition to District mentor Mentee meetings

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.

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.
Timothy Kutz, Principal; leadership in identifying focus for Professional Development and RtI process and targeting areas of concern in AYP subgroups; Align and coordinate strategies to SIP; facilitates Professional Development.

Carl DeFurio, Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction; Align strategies to SIP; leadership in identifying focus for Professional Development and RtI process and targeting areas of concern in AYP subgroups.

Michael Richardson, Assistant Principal of Attendance and Discipline; leadership in targeting areas of concern in AYP subgroups for PMP intervention analysis and implementation

Robert Dawes, Dean of Discipline, testing Coordinator; leadership in targeting areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention analysis and implementation, Professional Development facilitator.

Denyse Syfrett, Instructional Support Specialist, MTSS school based specialist targeting areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention analysis and implementation, Professional Development facilitator.

Elizabeth Ihle, Reading Coach, analyze strategies to target areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention and implementation

Kimberly Stalcup, Teacher, SIP Chair, CTEM Peer observer; analyze strategies to target areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention and implementation, align goals to school improvement plan; Professional Development facilitator.

Christina Zima, Teacher; analyze strategies to target areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention and implementation

Mike Wexler, Teacher; analyze strategies to target areas of concern in AYP subgroups for intervention and implementation

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?

Barron Collier High School meets as a MTSS/RtI Leadership team weekly to discuss the focus for Professional Learning Communities and target areas of concern (AYP subgroups) for Professional Development Plan (PMP) intervention analysis and implementation.

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 MTSS leadership team, in analyzing and interpreting all student data, has created an RtI action plan focusing on the implementation of strategies identified after disseminating the Florida Comprehensive Assessment test data and End of Course exam data. Indications in data showed areas of concern in 2 subgroups that the MTSS intervention team will be focusing on for the greatest impact on student achievement. The MTSS team used the 6 step discussion guide to define the problem, analyze the difficulty, determine our plan of intervention, discuss the data collection plan, write our goals and then will continuously review the success of this information for reevaluation.

MTSS Implementation

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

The primary source of data collection is Collier County's Data Warehouse that compiles all student standardized test scores as well as county and teacher developed tests to track student progress as well as target areas of concern. In addition, we will use StudentPass and TERMS to track student attendance and discipline issues.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff will be trained in the MTSS process through a culmination of PowerPoint presentations given through the PLCs, handouts, video clips and MTSS leadership initiated meetings given by the Intervention Support Specialist. Staff will also be encouraged to attend for additional MTSS training offered through the district. All faculty will also be trained in Differentiated Instruction to raise rigorous teaching standards to scaffold tier I learning school-wide.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Supporting MTSS will be done through continuous monitoring and constant reinforcement through the MTSS team, Intervention specialist and supporting administration. Data chats for Tier I, II, and III students will be held by TE on a weekly basis and reported to data warehouse of each interaction and the result. Monitoring will be conducted through benchmark assessments, behavior contracts and evaluations, and continual conferencing with students. MTSS is also supported through the Student Accountability Board (SAB) where leading students counsel with Tiered students to redirect behavior or academic progress.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Rebecca Henderson
Marci Garner
Richard McCarthy

Robert Dawes
Elizabeth Ihle

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership team will meet during PLC's to plan for literacy interventions or skills that will target goal areas to master student achievement in FCAT reading goals as well as to incorporate excellent reading strategies to integrate across the curriculum to enhance vocabulary and comprehension in every discipline.

FAA eligible students with disabilities: The LLT will provide opportunities to extend the six components of reading in differentiated literacy centers for the Unique Learning System's monthly thematic instructional unit. Literacy materials will be made accessible, not only for physical manipulation, but by adding pictures and objects along with print, or by modifying the cognitive demands of text content.

The LLT will conduct a needs assessment and analysis of the school data for all students taking the FAA in order to make decisions on how to implement the delivery of instruction to target the unique needs of students. The LLT will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies based on instructional targets in daily lesson and the student profile and checkpoint comparison. The team will meet on a monthly basis to monitor progress of all students scoring a Level 1, 2, and 3 on the FAA in the areas of math, reading, writing, or science, and, use the data from district and classroom assessments to determine mastery of access points for each student's level of academic functioning. The use of differentiated instructional delivery strategies will also be evident within the teacher's lesson plans, as well as, throughout professional learning. Based on all information gathered above, the LLT will determine the professional learning and resources needed to optimize instructional and intervention supports to improve instruction in the modified curricula classrooms.

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

Major initiatives for the Literacy team this year will be to work with the Reading Coherence Model implementing benchmarks throughout all subjects, implementing Intertextual Triads to support the switch to Common Core State Standards, and Check for 3 (use of capital letters, punctuation and complete sentences) in all classes.

The district Reading scores for students with significant cognitive disabilities are below the proficient level on the FAA. Improved instruction in Reading through direct systematic instruction is our primary focus. The district will require the use of Discrete Trial Trainer for students at the Emergent Level (FAA 1-3) in grades K-12; RAZ Kids for students at the Achieved Level (FAA 4-6) in grades K-12; and My Reading Coach for students at the Commended Level (FAA7-9) in grades K-12. Additionally, using small group instruction to target specific needs is a major component of our Reading program. Each school's leadership team will assist in this process by monitoring lesson plans and analyzing benchmark data. The LLT will utilize classroom walkthrough data in order to make midcourse adjustments in instruction. This data will be also analyzed by the instructional coaches to drive coaching practices by modeling, planning, and professional learning communities.

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.

Teaching Reading Coherence Model strategies across curriculum is our focus this year and will be incorporated within all Professional learning communities as well as leadership led PLC's. Accountability will be monitored in classroom walkthroughs and expectations re-taught. Additionally staff developments in Differentiated Instruction and lesson studies incorporating these reading strategies will be taught and then implemented throughout the school year.

Authentic and content specific literacy is the responsibility of all teachers. Although not every teacher is a reading teacher per

se, all teachers are indeed comprehension teachers who convey information to their students via the written word. In the effort to support literacy across disciplines, all secondary content area teachers in Collier County Public Schools teach the literacy standards of the Common Core State Standards and utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies that guide students in pre-reading, comprehension monitoring, and summative question generating when encountering text. In addition, CCPS offers NGCAR-PD courses in order to build teachers' capacity to provide scaffolded literacy instruction to striving readers.

As a result of classroom walkthroughs and observations, the LLT will ensure teachers of students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment are utilizing general guidelines for literacy instruction: (1) recognizing the link between communication and literacy; (2) maintaining high expectations for students to acquire literacy; (3) making literacy materials and activities accessible; (4) following the interest of the child; and (5) engaging the student in direct and systematic instruction

*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?

Career Education students are offered the opportunity to earn a third party industry approved certification which is designed to demonstrate to potential employers the technical skills and abilities for the students. Students also have the opportunity to earn the Florida Ready to Work Credential which is designed to demonstrate to future employers the reading and mathematics skills of the students. The purpose of both credentials is to integrate real world skills and abilities to the instructional objectives for both career and academic courses. In addition all CE programs offer the opportunity to include both On-the-Job Training and or Executive Internships to further show the relationships between high school programs and real world skills. In addition, the implementation of STEM has connected science, technology, engineering and math core coursework to potential careers in their respective fields. The focus of these courses will engage students in their learning, find value in their education, and pursue careers in these fields.

High School Career Academies and CE program teachers encourage all students to complete or update the FACTS.org planning document each school year. Counselors are expected meet regularly with CE students and other interested students to review CE Program of Study for each career education program that is offered at the school. Programs of Study and articulation agreements are available on line on the District website, Career guidance academic counseling provides access for students (and parents, as appropriate) to information regarding career awareness and planning with respect to an individual's occupational and academic future. This counseling also provides information with respect to career options, financial aid, and post-secondary options including college, technical, and post secondary educational opportunities. Counselors are specifically encouraged to work with CE students in the implementation of the approved Program of Study, and familiarize students with articulations opportunities and other post-secondary programs that are related to high school career pathways. Many CE students and all seniors are encouraged to earn a Florida Ready to Work certificate at the highest level possible. Students are also encouraged to take the appropriate pre-assessments in applied reading, applied math, and locating information tests which are a component of the Florida Ready to Work program.

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?

Through individual and group meetings, school counselor at Barron Collier High School initiate the course selection process in which students are offered individual as well as multiple course programs for their personal review and selection. Students are encouraged both in middle school and high school to consider their future career plans, and to develop an academic plan accordingly. Counselors on a yearly basis review individual students career and academic goals, and assist students in scheduling meaningful and appropriate courses.In addition to the Career and Technical courses available to all students, the Collier Skill Training for Employment Program (CO-STEP) is designed to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. This program provides life skills training, and counseling services to assist students with disabilities in successfully developing marketable skills in career and technical coursework as well as on-the-job training in the community.

Also, the military administers the ASVAB on campus once a year. This helps students determine their strongest natural aptitudes/abilities in comparison to the world of work.

High School Career Academies and CE program teachers encourage all students to complete or update the FACTS.org planning document each school year. Counselors are expected meet regularly with CE students and other interested students to review CE Program of Study for each career education program that is offered at the school. Programs of Study and articulation agreements are available on line on the District website, Career guidance academic counseling provides access for students (and parents, as appropriate) to information regarding career awareness and planning with respect to an individual's occupational and academic future. This counseling also provides information with respect to career options, financial aid, and postsecondary options including college, technical, and post secondary educational opportunities. Counselors are specifically encouraged to work with CE students in the implementation of the approved Program of Study, and familiarize students with articulations opportunities and other postsecondary programs that are related to high school career pathways. Many CE students and all seniors are encouraged to earn a Florida Ready to Work certificate at the highest level possible. Students are also encouraged to take the appropriate pre-assessments in applied reading, applied math, and locating information tests which are a component of the Florida Ready to Work program.

IEPs will incorporate the student's academic and career planning and guide course selection based on the needs, interests and strengths of the student. Intervention Support Specialists will assist teachers in using the UNIQUE Transition Curriculum and the Attainment: Life Skills to Academics Lessons for Math, Social Studies, Science/Health and Language Arts to aid students in understanding the connection among school, work, and their daily living skills.

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

Planning for post-secondary participation is a critical activity that must begin as a student enters the ninth grade. Schools can support students and parents by placing an emphasis on the following factors:
• Focus on improving and maintaining reading achievement scores
• Focus on improving and maintaining math achievement scores
• Counseling to take upper level math and science courses
• Counseling to take foreign language requirements
• Counseling to more effectively use Bright Futures scholarships such as FI Academic Scholars, FI Medallion Scholars, and FL Gold Seal Vocational Scholarship
• Counseling to enroll in college dual enrollment and AP courses while in high school
• Increase the availability of college dual enrollment courses
• Increasing articulation agreements between Collier County and appropriate post secondary schools
• Counseling to inform students of benefits of articulation agreements in college enrollment
• Counseling to take college placement exams such as CPT, SAT, and ACT
• Counseling to enroll seniors in college level remedial English and mathematics courses
• Increased emphasis on career counseling and career planning for all students with specific focus on postsecondary options
• Focus on FACTS.org as planning tool for college and technical school enrollment
• Increased utilization of technical school dual enrollment as stepping stone to other postsecondary programs
• Increased focus on career academies that lead to college enrollment such as Engineering Academy, Teacher Education Academy, Early Childhood Education Programs, Allied Health Science, and Criminal Justice
• Encourage students to earn Florida Ready to Work certificates and utilize career and college planning on-line assistance

IEP teams will implement with fidelity the UNIQUE Transition Curriculum and the Attainment: Aligning Life Skills to Academics Programs as a supplement to support life skill lessons aligned with math, science/health, social studies, and language.

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 the 2011/2012 school year 29% (242) of students achieved level 3 in FCAT reading.It is expected that 29% (257) will achieve level 3 in FCAT reading in 2012/2013. This represents a percent of students improving from levels 1 and 2 as well as a percent of students moving from level 3 into 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (242)	29% (257)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal, CTEM evaluators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.			
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	3.2 Instructional: Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model and intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Reading proficiency to 50%. NOTE: Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4 (58-72), Level 5 (73-86), Level 6 (87-98) It is important to note that BCHS FAA Students are Modified Curriculum I students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (1)	50% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	Provide Universal Design Lessons (UDL) based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) Raz Kids Discrete Trial Trainer

		upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation.			My Reading Coaches CTEM
2	1.2 Instructional: Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses.	Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

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:	In the 2011/2012 school year 42% (351) of students achieved levels 4 & 5 in FCAT reading. It is expected that 46% (409) will achieve levels 4 & 5 in FCAT reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%(351)	46%(409)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.3 Rigor Instructional: Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize close reading and re-reading of complex texts to provide textual support for reasoning/conclusions in response to higher order questions. TE will provide feedback to students regarding the quality of written responses. Does the response match the rigor or the question? CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Close Reading/Cornell Note Student Evidence, Student Projects and Essay Responses
	Common Objective	2.1a Professional	LLT/ Reading,	Instructional teams will	Quarterly

3	2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
6	3.2 Informational Text Instructional: Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Reading proficiency to a 7 for 33% (2 students) from 0 (0%). NOTE: Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: The results of the 2011 FAA Reading Test indicate that 0 or 0% of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7 or above in reading proficiency. Achieved Level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows:

	Level 4 (63-69), Level 5(70-84), Level 6 (85-98)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	33% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Instruction: Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data-collected through Pre-and Post-test Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	1.2 Instructional: Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses.	Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs	Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

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:	In the 2011/ 2012 school year 69% (499) of students achieved learning gains in FCAT reading. It is expected that 72% (577) will achieve learning gains in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%(499)	72%(577)

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
	Common Objective:	Teachers will use learning	LLT/ Reading, RtI,	Instructional teams will	Quarterly

1	1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	APC, Principal	disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated.	Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See Common Objective for Rigor(1).	Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations,	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal.		classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	
6	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2).	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Reading proficiency by 5 raw scores or 73 percentage points to 76%. NOTE: Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4 (58-72), Level 5 (73-86), Level 6 (87-98)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%(4)	76%(7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Instructional: Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses	Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team , IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
2	2.1 Instructional Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM

		learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In the 2011/2012 school year 72% (130) of students in the lowest quartile of achievement in FCAT reading achieved learning gains. It is expected that 75% (151) in the lowest quartile of achievement will achieve learning gains in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(130)	75%(151)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will closely monitor low-expectancy students for understanding of content, providing immediate interventions as appropriate.	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

3	communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.		revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See Common Objective for Rigor (1).	During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM)	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
6	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2).	Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
7	Informational Texts: Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently			

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In the 2011/2012 school year 51% (86) of students in the Hispanic subgroup in FCAT reading achieved proficiency. It is expected that 56% (111) of students in the Hispanic subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in reading in 2012/2013. In the 2011/ 2012 school year 50% (25) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup in FCAT reading achieved proficiency. It is expected that 55% (35) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (86)Hispanic students 50%(25) Black/ Creole	56% (111)Hispanic Students 55%(35) Black/ Creole

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

			level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM) 1.1c TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.			
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will maintain data to monitor subgroups to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		support for meeting high expectations. 2.1d TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.			
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See Common Objecticve for Rigor (1.1).	TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
6	3.2 Informational Text Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
7	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2.1).	TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In the 2011/2012 school year 44% (60) of students in the English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup in FCAT reading achieved proficiency. It is expected that 50% (28) of students in the English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(60)	50%(28)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c. TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding and identifying a variety of strategies to enhance ELL learners' understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning,	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

3	instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.		communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. 3.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	3.2 Informational Text Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
6	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2.1).	TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	See Common Objective for Rigor (1).	TE will conference individually with students to determine needs	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly

7		relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.		scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In the 2011/2012 school year 41% (34) of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup in FCAT reading achieved proficiency. It is expected that 47% (37) of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (34)	47% (37)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects, data chats

		remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Writing Samples with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See Common Objective for Rigor (1).	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiatedmaterials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
6	Informational Texts: Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies TE will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2).	TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing,

7		skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.		effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In the 2011/2012 school year 51% (126) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup in FCAT reading achieved proficiency. It is expected that 56% (162) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (126)	56% (162)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to	LLT/Reading, MTSS/RtI, All Building Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

2		check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. In addition to daily checks for understanding, monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 2.1d Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See Common Objective for Informational texts (3).	TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.		CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	
6	See Common Objective for Interactive Learning and DI (2).	TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
7	See Common Objective for Rigor (1).	TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC,Principal Instructional teams will review formative assessment reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Formative reading assessments, FAIR testing, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

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
Differentiated instructional practices, Common Assessment and alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	9-12 All Content Areas	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

Reading Budget:

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

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

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 the 2011/2012 school year 67% (34) scored proficient in Listening/Speaking. It is expected that 74%(38) will achieve proficiency in Listening/Speaking in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
67% (34)	

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	1.1 Rigor Instructional: Students have insufficient background knowledge of US cultural norms and content specific vocabulary to fully understand oral language.	1.1. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs. 1.2 TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations for participation in oral language opportunities. 1.3 Provide scaffolded support for ELL learners by inclusion in small group support for L 1 and 2 students as appropriate. 1.4 Monitor progress a minimum of once every	LLT/Reading, Administrators, Reading Coach	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review Lesson Studies and Formative Reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/APC, and Principal if needed.	CTEM Observations, Lesson Plans, Lesson Study Evaluation, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments and End of Course Exams, Student Projects

		2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data to determine additional supports that may be needed to improve oral language skills of identified ELL learners.			
2	2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Employ checks for understanding that include 1:1 questioning with the student or written responses to text dependent questions to determine student's level of understanding of what was read.	LLT/Reading, Administrators, Reading Coach	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review Lesson Studies and Formative Reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/APC, and Principal if needed. Data chats and PLC meetings will disaggregate data and review effective strategies.	CTEM Observations, Lesson Plans, Lesson Study Evaluation, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments and End of Course Exams, Data chats, PLC logs in data warehouse

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 the 2011/2012 school year 27% (14) scored proficient in Reading. It is expected that 30%(15) will achieve proficiency in Reading in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
30%(15)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1. ELL students experience delays in acquisition of reading skills due to limited vocabulary, limited experience to build background knowledge, limited English usage in the home and in many cases, illiteracy in the home.	2.1. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations for reading on grade level/ meeting grade level expectations. 2.2 Provide scaffolded support for ELL learners by inclusion in small group support for L 1 and 2 students as appropriate. 2.3 Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using running records or mini-cloze	LLT/Reading, APC, Principal	nstructional teams will disaggregate and review Lesson Studies and Formative Reading scores to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/APC, and Principal if needed. Data chats and PLC meetings will disaggregate data and review effective strategies.	CTEM Observations, Lesson Plans, Lesson Study Evaluation, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments and End of Course Exams, Data chats, PLC logs in data warehouse

1		reading assessments. 2.4 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. 2.5 Employ checks for understanding that include 1:1 questioning with the student or written responses to text dependent questions to determine student's level of understanding of what was read.			

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 the 2011/2012 school year 37% (19) scored proficient in Writing. It is expected that 41%(21) will achieve proficiency in Writing in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
41%(21)	

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	3.1. Students do not have opportunities for authentic conversations and evaluation of their own or others writing.	3.1a As evidence of strategic and extended thinking in writing, TE will hold students accountable for producing an oral or written analysis of multiple genres of thematically connected texts a minimum of six times per year. Depending on students' writing skills, the process may be implemented through Read-Alouds. 3.1b To develop strategic and extended thinking in regard to student writing, TE will provide opportunities for peer evaluation of students' writing based on the writing rubric. Students will be	LLT/Reading, Administrators, Reading Coach	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review Student writing samples and writing scores to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/APC, and Principal if needed.	CTEM Observations, Lesson Plans, Writing Rubrics, Student Writing Samples

		accountable for defending their thinking based on specific examples from the writing and their understanding of expectations for quality writing, providing recommendations for improving the writing.			
2	3.2 Students have not developed proficiency in editing and improving their own writing as a way to develop their thinking and use of appropriate vocabulary.	3.2a In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence.	LLT/Reading, Administrators, Reading Coach	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review Student writing samples and writing scores to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/APC, and Principal if needed.	CTEM Observations, Lesson Plans, Writing Rubrics,Formative Assessment, FAIR testing for vocabulary acquisition, Student Writing Samples

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Math proficiency from 0 percentage points to 33% (2). Note that 6 students are being tested. NOTE: The results of the 2011 FAA (District) Math Test indicate that 87 or 34 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4-6 in math at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4 (58-72), Level 5 (73-86), Level 6 (87-98)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0 (0%)	2 (33%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Instructional: Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
2	1.2 Instructional: Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM

		learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation			

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Math proficiency. NOTE: The results of the 2011 FAA (District) Math Test indicate that 83 or 32% of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7-9 in math at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Commended Level: Level 7 (99-110), Level 8 (111-123), Level 9 (124-144) It is important to note that students attending BC are in the Modified Curriculum I class.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0 (0%)	1 (17%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1 Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
2	2b.2. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	2b2. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM

		knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation			

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:	In the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA), the expected percent of students making learning gains in mathematics are 33% (2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0 (0%)	2 (33%)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	3b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	3b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	3b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

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 the 2011/2012 school year 46% (140) of students scored a Level 3 in Algebra. It is expected that 47%(140) will achieve a Level 3 in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (140)	53% (161)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal, CTEM evaluators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective	In all content areas	LLT/ Reading,	Utilize writing in all	Student Essays

4	3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See 1.1 Rigor	Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. Students' graphing their progress provides a check for understanding to inform instruction.	See 1.1 Rigor	See 1.1 Rigor	See 1.1 Rigor
6	See 1.2 Rigor	Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity.	See 1.2 Rigor	See 1.2 Rigor	See 1.2 Rigor

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:	In the 2011/2012 school year 21% (65) of students achieved levels 4 & 5 in Algebra. It is expected that 23% (69) will achieve levels 4 & 5 in Algebra in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (65)	23% (69)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

2	Common Objective 1.3 Rigor Instructional: Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize close reading and re-reading of complex texts to provide textual support for reasoning/conclusions in response to higher order questions. TE will provide feedback to students regarding the quality of written responses. Does the response match the rigor or the question? CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Close Reading/Cornell Note Student Evidence, Student Projects and Essay Responses
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	In the 2011/2012 school year 56% (40) of students in the Hispanic subgroup in Algebra achieved proficiency. It is expected that 60% (52) of students in the Hispanic subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Algebra in 2012/2013. In the 2011/ 2012 school year 59% (17) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup in Algebra achieved proficiency. It is expected that 63% (16) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Algebra in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic 56%(40) Black/Creole 59%(17)	Hispanic 56%(40) Black/Creole 63%(16)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM) 1.1c TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective	1.2a. Teachers will utilize	MTSS/RtI,	During observations,	Quarterly

2	1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will maintain data to monitor subgroups to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	Administrators	administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. 2.1d TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs,	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

		supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.		lesson plans	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	In the 2011/2012 school year 51% (33) of students in the English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup achieved proficiency in Algebra. It is expected that 56% (14) of students in the English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Algebra in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51%(33)	56%(14)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c. TE will utilize a variety of ELL strategies to enhance understanding of content.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding and identifying a variety of strategies to enhance ELL learners' understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. 3.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing 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:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	In the 2011/2012 school year 33% (14) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) achieved proficiency in Algebra. It is expected that 40% (14) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make adequate yearly progress in Algebra in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(14)	40%(14)

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
	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments,

1	routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.		effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects, data chats
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Writing Samples with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

		opportunities in daily instructional practices.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	In the 2011/2012 school year 51% (68) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged (ED)subgroup achieved proficiency in Algebra. It is expected that 56% (63) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Algebra in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (68)	56% (63)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. In addition	LLT/Reading, MTSS/RtI, All Building Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

		to daily checks for understanding, monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 2.1d Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

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 83% (293) of students achieved proficiency/Level 3 on the Geometry EOC. It is projected that 86% (305) of students will achieve proficiency/ level 3 in 2012/2013.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (293)	86% (305)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal, CTEM evaluators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

				plans	
5	See 1.1 Rigor	Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations.	See 1.1 Rigor	See 1.1 Rigor	See 1.1 Rigor

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	In 2011/2012 55% (195) of students achieved a Level 4 on the Geometry EOC. It is projected that 60% (213) of students will achieve a Level 4 on the Geometry EOC in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(195)	60%(213)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.3 Rigor Instructional: Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize close reading and re-reading of complex texts to provide textual support for reasoning/conclusions in response to higher order questions. TE will provide feedback to students regarding the quality of written responses. Does the response match the rigor or the question? CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Close Reading/Cornell Note Student Evidence, Student Projects and Essay Responses
	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional:	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining,	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End

3	Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.		of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	In the 2011/2012 school year ____% (___) of students in the Hispanic subgroup in Geometry achieved proficiency. It is expected that ____% (___) of students in the Hispanic subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Geometry in 2012/2013. In the 2011/ 2012 school year ____% (____) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup in Geometry achieved proficiency. It is expected that ____% (____) of students in the Black/Creole subgroup will make adequate yearly progress in Geometry in 2012/2013.
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
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM) 1.1c TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning,	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

2		clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will maintain data to monitor subgroups to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. 2.1d TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high	MTSS/RtI, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

		expectations.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	In the 2011/ 2012 school year ____% (____) of ELL students in Geometry achieved proficiency. It is expected that ____% (____) of ELL students will make adequate yearly progress in Geometry in 2012/2013.
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
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c. TE will utilize a variety of ELL	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding and identifying a variety of strategies to enhance ELL learners' understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

		strategies to enhance understanding of content.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding. 3.1b Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. 3.1c TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing 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:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	In the 2011/ 2012 school year ____% (____) of SWD students in Geometry achieved proficiency. It is expected that ____% (____) of SWD students will make adequate yearly progress in Geometry in 2012/2013.
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
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers, appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects, data chats
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective 3.1 Informational	3.1a In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to	Student Writing

4	Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	articulate understanding. 3.1b TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction) . Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.		provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Samples with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing 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:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	In the 2011/ 2012 school year ____% (____) of Economically disadvantaged students in Geometry achieved proficiency. It is expected that ____% (____) of Economically disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress in Geometry in 2012/2013.
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
1	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1a Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1.1b Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response. 1.2b Utilize exit slips, whiteboards, clickers,	LLT/Reading, MTSS/RtI, All Building Administrators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

2		appropriate questioning, clarifying and summarizing techniques, teacher circulating to check for understanding, followed by instructional adaptation as a result of the monitoring activity. 1.2c For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. In addition to daily checks for understanding, monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group.			
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 2.1d Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT, Administrators	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

				walkthroughs, lesson plans	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated instructional practices, Common Assessment and alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	9-12 All Math and Related Courses	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice. CCPS yearlong self-paced Agile Mind and CCSS PD that helps teachers strengthen their instructional & assessment strategies and also to develop alternate methods to differentiate their instruction.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	In the 2011-2012 school year, 0% (0) scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Florida Alternate Assessment in science. In the 2012-2013 school year, 16% (1) are expected to achieve levels 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	16%(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	1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for scientific exploration.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
2	1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	1b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data-Collected through Pre-test, Post-test Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM

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:	
	In the 2011-2012 school year, 0% (0) scored at Levels 7 or above in Florida Alternate Assessment in science. In the 2012-2013 school year, 10% (4) are expected to achieve levels 7 or above on the FAA science.

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	NOTE: The results of the 2012 FAA (District) Science Test indicate that 43 or 39 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7-9 in Science at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Commended Level: Level 7 (103-113), Level 8 (114-124), Level 9 (125-144)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	10% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	2b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	UNIQUE: Monthly Benchmark Assessments UNIQUE: Checkpoints and Profile Comparisons CTEM
2	2b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	2b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for scientific exploration.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	In the 2011/2012 school year 36% (134) of students) achieved level 3 in FCAT Science. It is expected that 40% (186) of science students will pass the Biology EOC exams in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (134)	40% (186)

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal, CTEM evaluators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

		instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.			
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
5	See 1 Rigor	Utilize 5E model of science instruction with fidelity, emphasizing hands-on opportunities, notebooking and vocabulary development. Display LG and scale to demonstrate high expectations for mastery of the standard/benchmark. In science notebooks, students will identify an achievement level (3 or 4) and the work they will do to demonstrate mastery. To ensure that students are making progress toward mastery, a minimum of weekly, require text-dependent written responses to questions from quadrants 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK.	See 1 Rigor	See 1 Rigor	See 1 Rigor
6	See 2 Interactive Learning and DI	During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration.	See 2 Interactive Learning and DI	See 2 Interactive Learning and DI	See 2 Interactive Learning and DI
7	See 3 Informational Text	Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies (Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area reading.	See 3 Informational Text	See 3 Informational Text	See 3 Informational 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 group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	In 2011/2012 13% (49)of students achieved Level 4 on the Biology EOC. It is projected that 14% (65) of students will achieve a Level 4 in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

13% (49)	14% (65)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	See Common Objective 1.1	Students will be expected to set a goal for achieving a 4 on the scale and will identify the work they will do to demonstrate exemplary mastery of the standard/benchmark. Ex.: For text-dependent written responses, students must reference a minimum of 2 outside sources to either support or refute the student's conclusions. TE will provide scaffolded support in order to develop students' ability to successfully meet this expectation.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
2	See Common Objective 2.1	During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	See Common Objective 3.1	Students will extend their learning by writing in a science notebook as a matter of routine to organize their authentic thoughts about labs and content learning. This habit will encourage student's original thoughts and beliefs about science in their world. The science notebook can serve as an end-of-year portfolio of essential learning.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects

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
Differentiated instructional practices, Common Assessment and alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	9-12 All Science Courses	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean
Implementing the 5E instructional model in science, the use of notebooking, and classroom technology	9-12 All Science Courses	Department Chair	All science teachers	Monthly department meetings	Data Warehouse PLC entries, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

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.	In the 2011/2012 school year 92% (379) of students in FCAT writing made achieved level 3.0-3.9.. It is expected

Writing Goal #1a:	that 100%(443) of students in will achieve level 3.0-3.9 in writing in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92%(379)	100%(443)

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	1.1 Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking	1a. TE will develop higher order questions that are text dependent and require students to utilize close reading and re-reading of complex texts. Questions should be designed in such a way as to lead students into strategic and extended thinking to match the level of rigor appropriate to the standard/benchmark. 1b. To develop strategic and extended thinking in regard to student writing, TE will provide opportunities for peer evaluation of students' writing based on the writing rubric. Students will be accountable for defending their thinking based on specific examples from the writing and their understanding of expectations for quality writing, providing recommendations for improving the writing. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1d. To ensure rigorous expectations for	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores, Quarterly Writing Prompt

		student writing, a minimum of 50% of student writing will be content-based written responses to multiple texts and demonstrate thinking skills appropriate to levels 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK. 1e. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence. 1f. To ensure rigorous expectations for student writing, Baseline, End of Quarter 1, End of Quarter 2, and EOY writing assessments will be administered with opportunity for and focus on revision based on teacher feedback.			
2	2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2b. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal Instructional teams will disaggregate data and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if needed. Common writing rubrics communicated and used throughout all content areas.	CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores, PLC data
3	3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	3a. Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-12), in grades K-2 through Read-Alouds and in grades 3-12 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies 3b. As evidence of strategic and extended thinking in writing, TE will hold students accountable for producing a written analysis of multiple genres of thematically	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal Instructional teams will disaggregate and review lesson studies to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated.	CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores

		connected texts a minimum of six times per year.			

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:	In the 2011-2012 school year, 0% (0) achieved 4 or higher in FAA writing. In 2012-2013, 16% (1) will achieve 4 or higher on the FAA writing assessment. It is important to note that FAA students at BCHS are Modified Curriculum I students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	16% (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	1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	1b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

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
Instructional practices focusing on conventions, grading procedures and rubrics and alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	9-12 All Courses School-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	In the 2011/2012 school year 64% (548) of students achieved level 3.0-3.9 on the U.S. History EOC. It is expected that 67%(575) of students will achieve level 3.0-3.9 in U.S. History in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

64% (548) achieved a level 3 or higher on EOC U.S. History	67% (575) achieving a level 3 or higher on EOC U.S. History

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	Common Objective 1.1 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	Common Objective 1.2 Rigor Instructional: Checks for understanding are not used or are used inappropriately in many classrooms.	1.2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate checks for understanding throughout lessons to ensure students are obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills, e.g., exit ticket, journal response.	MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal, CTEM evaluators	During observations, administrators will utilize CTEM to monitor checks for understanding as a routine part of the lesson.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects
3	Common Objective 2.1 Interactive Learning and DI Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	2.1a Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. 2.1b During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. 2.1c Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will disaggregate and review common assessment to determine effectiveness of strategy based on mastery levels and communicate need for revision to LLT/ APC, and Principal, if indicated. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
4	Common Objective 3.1 Informational Text Instructional: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	In all content areas teachers will implement entrance and exit tickets to articulate understanding.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Utilize writing in all content areas to provide opportunities for writing that all TE provide accurate feedback with regard to conventions. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Student Essays with Conventions Feedback, Formative Assessments, Writing Scores
	3.2 Informational Text Instructional:	TE will develop higher order questions that are text dependent and	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review strategies utilizing close reading to	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments,

5	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	require students to utilize close reading and re-reading of complex texts. Questions should be designed in such a way as to lead students into strategic and extended thinking to match the level of rigor appropriate to the standard/benchmark.		determine effectiveness of strategies. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	In the 2011/2012 school year 52% (447) of students U.S. History EOC achieved level 4 or above. It is expected that 55%(475) of students will achieve level 4.0 or above in U.S. History in 2012/2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (447) Achieved a 4 or above Achievement Level in U.S. History	55% (475) Achieved a 4 or above Achievement Level in U.S. History

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	1.3 Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review strategies utilizing close reading to determine effectiveness of strategies. CTEM Observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.
2	2.1 See Interactive Learning Strategies & DI	Teachers and students will follow the newly designed curriculum pacing map that aligns the NGSSS and CCSS to the newly adopted instructional materials.	LLT/ Reading, MTSS/RtI, APC, Principal	PLC teams will review curriculum and pacing guides and align instructional practices and the use of common assessments. PLC Data, Data Warehouse, CTEM Domain 2	Common Assessments, End of Course Exams
3	3.2 Informational Text Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Use Intertextual Triad, Close Reading and Cornell Note strategies to support students in this essential approach to extending content area writing quarterly.	LLT/ Reading, APC, Principal	Instructional teams will review strategies utilizing close reading to determine effectiveness of strategies.	Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Assessments, End of Course Exams, Student Projects.

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
Differentiated Instructional practices,common assessment, common rubrics, discussion of rigorous course content and higher order thinking questions, alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	11th grade; All U.S. History Courses	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice.	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In the 2011/2012 school year 96%(1685) of students achieved adequate attendance. It is expected that 98% (1798) will progress towards advanced attendance In the 2011/2012 school year 18%(345) of students had excessive absences. It is expected that only 16% of students will have excessive absences.

	In the 2011/2012 school year 0% (1) student had excessive tardies. It is expected that 0% of students will have excessive tardies in 2012/13.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96% (1685)	98% (1798)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
18%(345)	16% (318)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0%(1)	0% (0)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Due to economic issues some students may have limited home resources and limited school readiness.	1.1 Attendance incentives through Positive Behavior Support	1.1 RtI/MTSS Coordinator, Principal and APD and Dean	1.1 Attendance team will continuously monitor and assess the effectiveness of the attendance utilizing PBS and the tracking of students patterns in attendance.	1.1 Students pass/ terms generated reports, the continuous monitoring of information through dissemination and reflective analysis.
2	1.2 Students do not find classes relevant or sufficiently engaging and choose to miss school.	1.2 Teachers will use interactive learning strategies combined with inquiry-based, project-focused instruction (STEM) to create interest and engagement in course work.	1.2 Principal, AP of Attendance and Discipline, Dean and RtI/MTSS Specialist	1.2 The Attendance team will continuously monitor and assess the effectiveness of the attendance policy as a deterrent to students through the tracking of attendance patterns and CTEM observations.	1.2 Student pass/ Terms generated reports, the continuous monitoring of information through dissemination and reflective analysis, CTEM Observations.

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
Differentiated Instructional practices to engage						

students, discussion of rigorous course content and higher order thinking questions, Real-world connection activities, alignment with NGSSS and/or Common Core Standards.	All Courses and Grades, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, consistent dialogue to encourage growth in instructional practice, CTEM observations	Principal, APC, APD and Dean

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:	In the 2011-2012 School year 4% (72) of students were in school suspended. It is expected that 2%(36) will be in school suspended in 2011/ 2012. In the 2011/2012 school year 7%(121) of students were out of school suspended. It is expected that 5%(91) of students will be out of school suspended in the 2012/2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
4% (72)	2% (36)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

4%(72)	2%(36)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
7%(211)	5%(91)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
7%(121)	5%(91)

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	1.1 Limited strategies by discipline and RtI team to motivate students to behave and stay in compliance with all of the school rules	1.1 The school will continue to grow the Positive Behavior Support System that will create motivation and rewards for good behavior targeting students of concern. 1.2 School will utilize Student Accountability Board, a peer-mentoring program to redirect inappropriate behavior or poor academic progress of at-risk students.	APD/Dean, Principal and MTSS/RtI Coordinator	Continuous evaluation of infraction reports and referrals.	Terms and Student Pass Programs
2	1.2 There is a lack of social norm and self-discipline instruction within our instructional programming.	1.2a Teachers will implement and instruct PBS expectations and utilize PBS incentive processes in their classrooms. 1.2b Teachers will utilize Infraction reports and student pass to record and track behavior modifications within the classroom. 1.2c Teachers will reteach classroom expectations and social norms.	APD/Dean and Principal	CTEM observations, Professional development to implement differentiated instruction.	CTEM observations, Terms and Student Pass Programs

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
Differentiated Instructional practices to engage students, Real-world connection activities to validate learning, PBS/MTSS review process including infractions on Student Pass	All Courses and Grades, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, Student Pass monitoring, CTEM observations	Principal,APD and Dean

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	In the 2011/2012 school year %.6 (11) of students dropped out of school. It is expected that %.4 (9) will leave school of their own volition.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:

.6% (11)	.4% (9)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
93.6% (380)	95.6% (389)

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	1.1 Some students experience difficulty meeting all of the graduation requirements: - Achieving FCAT proficiency -Earning sufficient credits -Meeting the minimum GPA of 2.0 -Achieving proficiency on the ACT and/or ACT as a concurrent score	1.1a Problem identification and analysis 1.1b Monthly PLC/Data Team discussions 1.1c Counseling students on a consistent basis, data chats and parent involvement	Principal, RtI/MTSS team, Leadership team, Literacy team	Continuous analysis of grades, attendance,and discipline; data chats with students, consistent contact with parents to monitor progress; data contact log	Grade book Terms Student Pass Data Warehouse

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
Differentiated Instructional practices to engage students, Real-world connection activities to validate learning, connection to career and college goals, PBS/MTSS/RtI review process to encourage meaningful school presence for students	All Courses and Grades, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, Student Pass monitoring, CTEM observations	Principal,APC,APD and Dean

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	80%(1396) In the 2011/2 school year 80% (1396) Parents were somehow involved in the school. It is expected that in 2012/2013 90% (1592) will be involved in some activity within the school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
80%(1396) In the 2010/2011 school year 80% (1396) Parents were somehow involved in the school. It is expected that 90% (1592) will be involved in some activity within the school.	90%(1592) It is expected that 90% (1592) will be involved in some activity within the 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
1	1.1 Students have non-English speaking parents. They feel uncomfortable linguistically in the school setting. They also prefer printed materials in their native language sent home from the school.	1.1a Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole.	Leadership Team/Principal	Continuous analysis of parents involved in opportunities	Parent Survey and Observations
	2.1 Students are not engaged in school activities thus leaving	2.1a Provide career and club fairs to engage students in school	Principal, APC, APD, Dean	Continuous analysis of parent involvement.	Attendance at various events, enrollment in

2	parents uninvolved in the school setting.	activities; use communication means to disseminate information in a timely manner			activities and parent attendance, observations

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
Differentiated Instructional practices to engage students, Real-world connection activities to validate learning, connection to career and college goals, PBS/MTSS/RtI review process to encourage meaningful school presence for students	All Courses and Grades, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, Student Pass monitoring, CTEM observations	Principal,APC,APD and Dean

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	90% of teachers will receive professional learning designed to develop pedagogical skills in integrated inquiry-based teaching and learning of STEM concepts. These skills include technology content that includes the use of tools for enhancing teaching and learning science, engineering and mathematics, i.e., designing authentic projects, inquiry-based, project-based instruction that encourages innovations, inventions and applications.

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	1.1. Many teachers do not understand the connection of STEM to a specific content and may be resistant to incorporating STEM skills and strategies into their content.	1.1a Provide meaningful professional learning that effectively models STEM skills and strategies and builds collaborative PLCs for the purpose of infusing these skills and strategies across all content. 1.2b Incorporate real-world projects connected to math, science and engineering disciplines. Generate student interest by focusing on invention, creation, and innovation.	Leadership Team, RtI/MTSS Team, Literacy Team	CTEM Observations, Data Warehouse, Professional Development	Formative and Summative Assessments, daily observations, CTEM Observations
2	1.2. Students do not clearly understand the importance of taking higher level math, science, AP and dual enrollment courses in regard to future career options.	1.2a. Use resources such as email, Edmodo, assemblies, electronic flyers, etc. to promote STEM courses and careers. 1.2b Monitor numbers and percentages of students in all STEM courses with a goal of increasing enrolment in these courses by 10%	Leadership Team, RtI/MTSS Team, Literacy Team	CTEM Observations, Data Warehouse, Professional Development	Formative and Summative Assessments, daily observations, CTEM Observations

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

Differentiated Instructional practices to engage students in STEM, Real-world connection activities to validate learning and to encourage student inquiry and discovery, connection to career and college goals to encourage meaningful school presence for career and college ready students.	All Science, Math, Technical, Computer and Engineering related courses, all Grade levels, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, CTEM observations	Principal,APC,APD and Dean

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Increase the number of students passing industry certification testing and increase student and parent awareness of industry certification opportunities via course selection process and communication of programs. The 2011-2012 data indicated that 5% (87) of all enrolled students achieved industry certification. The goal for 2012-2013 is to increase industry certification as well as generate interest in the programs to increase overall participation. The 2012-2013 expected industry

	certification is 123 students or 7% of the student body.

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	1.1 Career Themed Courses have not been identified for each school. Consideration at each school must be teacher certifications, course requests, and computer lab accessibility.	1.1a Administrative and teacher teams identify courses that meet statutory requirements as Career Themed Courses and develop support mechanisms to meet industry certification testing preparation and testing. 1.1b Career and Technical Education Courses must include access to industry certification testing for all students in all CTE courses. Industry certification to be identified for each CTC that is offered.	Principal, APC, Guidance	Terms, Course enrollment data,	CTEM Observations, daily observations, course names
2	1.2 Career Academies have not been identified for students aligning in particular career paths.	1.2a Administrative and teacher teams identify courses that meet statutory requirements as Career Themed Courses and develop support mechanisms for established Academies in the school.	Principal, APC Guidance Counselors	Data Chats, PLCs, Professional Development	Course selections, Guidance and Career Paths for students, Data warehouse

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
Differentiated Instructional practices to engage students, Real-world connection activities to validate learning and to encourage student learning for connection to career and college goals to encourage meaningful school presence for career and college ready	Career and Technical Education related courses, all Grade levels, school-wide	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers	Each PLC is comprised of common content area teachers in all grade levels, school-wide.	PLC meetings are scheduled twice monthly with one meeting facilitated by an assigned administrator after school.	Data Warehouse, Reports to Administration, CTEM observations	Principal,APC,APD and Dean

students.						

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Funds to support a Saturday School as an alternative to OSS.	$4,500.00
Professional Development costs for staff.	$5,000.00

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

SAC will vote on opportunities involving professional development for staff, budget allocation, and bridge the communication gap

between all stakeholders. SAC is committed to developing effective means of communication.

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

Collier School District
BARRON COLLIER HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	92%	92%	50%	306	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%	84%			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?	51% (YES)	79% (YES)			130	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					593	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Collier School District
BARRON COLLIER HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	90%	87%	51%	297	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	65%	80%			145	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?	54% (YES)	69% (YES)			123	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					575	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested