FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GOLDEN GATE HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Jose L. Hernandez

SAC Chair: Derek Harp

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: November, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

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	Jose L. Hernandez	Specialist in Educational Leadership Master of Music Education Bachelors in Music Education	9	14	School grade improved from an "F" in 2008 to a "C" in 2009. GGHS has maintained a "C" grade, but have made consistent and steady gains in student performance. While the 2012 school grades have not yet been released, a 39 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY11 to SY12. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68%

					in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math. Prior schools I have worked at include: Bethune Adult Education Center SY 2003-2004, no school grades were issued since it is an adult center. Lely High School - SY1999-2003: school grades were C's.
Assis Principal	Daniel Cox	Masters in Educational Leadership – NOVA Southeastern Bachelors in Social Science – Wilmington College	9	9	School grade improved from an "F" in 2008 to a "C" in 2009. While the 2012 school grades have not yet been released, a 56 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY10 to SY11. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68% in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math.
Assis Principal	Rachel Dawes	Degrees – EdD – Organizational Leadership M.S. – Educational Leadership B.S. – Exceptional Student Education Certifications – 1. Educational Leadership 2. Emotionally Handicapped 3. Specific Learning Disabilities	9	5	School grade improved from an "F" in 2008 to a "C" in 2009. While the 2011 school grades have not yet been released, a 56 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY10 to SY11. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68% in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math.

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)
					School grade improved from an "F" in 2008 to a "C" in 2009. While the 2011 school grades have not yet been released, a 56 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY10 to SY11. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing

ELL SIOP Coach	Joe Altruda	B.A. in Speech & Education M.A. in Spanish Certified in Spanish ELL Endorsed	8		increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68% in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math. Mr. Altruda has been at GGHS since the school opened. Prior to that, he taught Spanish at NHS and GCH, and also taught Spanish at the middle school level in previous years. Mr. Altruda is a Spanish teacher at GGH and World Language Department Chair in addition to being the District World Language Lead Teacher.
Math/Science	Kimberly Ragusa	B.S. in Mathematics Education ELL Endorsed, CAR-PD Endorsed Gifted Endorsed	7	1	School grade improved from an “F” in 2008 to a “C” in 2009. While the 2011 school grades have not yet been released, a 56 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY10 to SY11. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68% in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math. Mrs. Ragusa has been at Golden Gate since 2005 and was math department chair when the school improved from an F to a C. Prior to that she was at Gulf Coast High School as a Math teacher for two years when they were rated an A. She also taught at Naples High School for 6 years prior to teaching at Gulf Coast High School.
Academic/PBS Coach	Melissa Rooney	B.S. Special Education M.A. Mental Retardation Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed National Board Certified Teacher 0-21 Special Needs	8	2	School grade improved from an “F” in 2008 to a “C” in 2009. While the 2011 school grades have not yet been released, a 56 point increase in FCAT indicators has been made from SY10 to SY11. In 2009 GGHS improved from 62% of subgroups meeting AYP, to 85% and moved from Correct II to Correct I. The gain scores decreased significantly in 2010 placing us back to Correct II and the percent meeting AYP decreased to 74%. In Reading, the percent proficient increased from 34% in 2009 to 37% in 2010; proficient in Writing increased from 75% to 86%; proficient in Science increased from 21% to 25%; proficient in Math decreased from 66% to 62%. Learning gains decreased from 52% to 42% in Reading and 73% to 66% in Math. The lowest quartile gains decreased from 53% to 35% in Reading and 65% to 57% in Math. In 2011 40% met standards in Reading,68% in Math, 80% in Writing, and 30% in Science. Our lowest quartile improved in 2011 with 48% making gains in Reading and 78% making gains in Math. Before GGHS opened Mrs. Rooney was part of the Vineyards Elementary School from 1999-2004 where a grade of "A" was achieved.
Science	Tara Bode	B.S. Secondary Education: Biology Concentration M.Ed. Educational Leadership Certification: Biology 6-12	9	1	Ms. Bode has been at GGHS since the school opened. Prior to that she was at Gulf Coast High School as a Science teacher for 1 year when they were rated an "A".
		B.S. Elementary Education; M.S.			2009-12 Naples High School, Freshmen

Reading/ Literacy	Diane Krapf	Reading/ Elementary Education, (grades K - 6); English For Speakers Of Other Languages (ESOL), Endorsement; English, (grades 6 - 12); Reading, (grades K - 12)			English/Reading 2007-09 Lely High School, Intensive Reading Teacher 2002 2005-07 Poinciana Elementary School, 3rd Grade Teacher 2002-05 Manatee Elementary School, 3rd Grade Teacher 2012 FCAT Reading results: Average Gain, 8; State Gain, 66%; % above District Mean, 62%

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	3. Site-based and district professional development targeted to teacher needs.	Principal /Assistant Principal/District HR & PD staff	Ongoing	
2	2. Utilization of the TOPS (Teacher Orientation Program) at the school and District level to support and strengthen new teachers.	Principal /Assistant Principal/District HR & PD staff	Ongoing	
3	1. Strategies will include but not be limited to the following: Grade level and subject specific Professional Learning Communities, Data Teams, continuous dialogue with regard to best instructional practices to maximize student achievement, continuous data analysis and discussion with regard to continuous improvement, Collier Teacher Evaluation Model to further improve and highlight effective teaching and learning practices, promotion of the co-teaching model, team building/teaching with your strengths through the strengthfinder model, various instructional trainings and celebrations of success, Titan 101 monthly in-service training, Peer Mentoring program, and district level staff development and HR procedures.	Principal/A.P./Instructional Coaches/RtI Specialist	Ongoing throughout the course of the school year	
4	4. Titan 101: a bi-monthly staff development activity targetting new teachers to Collier County and Golden Gate High School. The focus is to provide additional support in implementing daily routines and school-wide initiatives.	Administration & Academic Coaches	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
3%(3)	These teachers are currently in-field in their primary area of assignment, but out-of-field in a secondary area of assignment. The strategy being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective includes a plan to take the necessary subject area exam, earn the necessary endorsements, and ongoing PD and monitor of planning, delivery of instruction, and classroom management.

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
100	9.0%(9)	42.0%(42)	18.0%(18)	40.0%(40)	48.0%(48)	96.0%(96)	16.0%(16)	4.0%(4)	21.0%(21)

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
Thommie Sue Scott	Jessica Hernandez	Same Department, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
Kim Ragusa	Sandra Rosabella	Department Chair, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
Alex Kukushkin	Amanda Steffan	Same Department, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
			Monthly group mentoring

	Connie Mazgaj	Robert Wind	Department Chair, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
	Tara Bode	Lauren Zuchnik	Same Department, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
	Beth Elledias	Allison Tucker	Department Chair, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
	Kim Culpepper	Pete Stelzer	Department Chair, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior

			Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
Kim Ragusa	Jessica Ramer	Co-Teacher, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI
Kristy Cassese	Sara Dennison	Department Chair, Clinical Education Trained, Experienced & Effective Teacher	Monthly group mentoring activities designed by the school and district; weekly mentor support, observations, and PLC's; follow district mentoring protocols. New Teacher Induction program, weekly PLC meetings, weekly team meetings, RTI and data analysis meetings, monthly New Teacher meetings encompassing various topics; Angel Program (TOP Resources will be in Angel), Data Warehouse Program/AYP, Strategies for implementing the Co-Teaching Instructional Model, Behavior Plans/504's/IEP's/EP's/PMP's and PBS/RTI

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 A
•The Collier County School district provides a systematic and strategic approach to providing services through the District Strategic Plan, 3 Year Academic Plan, the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and District Collaborative Planning process. Goals and objectives of each program and department are aligned with these overarching district plans. Additionally:
•Title I Parts A, C, D, and School Improvement (1003a and 1003g), Title II Part A and Title III are managed out of the same Federal and State Grants and English Language Learner Office in Collier County. They share administrative staff so that oversight, coordination, budgeting, staffing, and monitoring are efficiently and effectively coordinated. In addition to informal communications, monthly formal administrative meetings are held to discuss program needs, issues and coordinate efforts.
•Support staff of the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs meet regularly to coordinate efforts and receive joint staff development for improving their services.
•Regularly scheduled Curriculum and Instruction department meetings are scheduled that include district level program coordinators, including IDEA, Perkins, Head Start, Supplemental Academic Instruction, Advanced Placement Initiative, Career and Technical Education.
•LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant, Title X coordinate services to assist homeless parents of homeless children, and shelters representing the homeless children to resolve problems concerning registration and educational services at Title I schools. The LEA provides services in coordination with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

•Title I and District joint funding of the Homeless Liaison staff position and use of additional Title I Part A funds to provide after school tutorials for homeless students in non-Title I schools.
•Title I Part A, Title II Part A and RTTT fund exam reimbursements to ensure staff meet HQT Requirements.
•Title I Part A funds used in collaboration with Title I SIG 1003g, Title II Part A and Reading to fund Academic Coaches at Elementary, Middle and High schools, depending on school DA status and professional learning needs of school faculty.
•As applicable, depending on school:
•District Resource Team meetings will provide forum for coordination and integration of resources to support unique needs of school sites.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part C- Migrant
•Title I Migrant, Title I Basic, Title III funds are coordinated to provide at risk students with supplemental instructional support and resources in form of supplemental resource teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, tutors.
•Title I Migrant, Title I Basic and Title II Part A funds are coordinated to provide customized professional learning that ensures students receive high quality, differentiated instruction.
•Title I Migrant and school collaboration occurs with local eye doctor to provide eye exams and glasses at no cost to migrant students in need or at a discounted price to our program.
•Coordination occurs with Homeless Liaison staff and Title I Migrant staff in identifying eligible students and families that can be served as homeless.

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title II
• Title II, Part A collaborates with Collier County Public School's Human Resources in providing funds that are used to reimburse teachers striving to meet Highly Qualified
• Teacher requirements through subject area tests. This helps ensure that all teachers meet HQT requirements and provide high quality instruction.
• Title II funds will support schools with instructional coaching, lesson planning and professional learning by funding several teachers on special assignment in areas of Math and Science; these staff will integrate with the instructional staff at school sites to ensure high quality instruction differentiated to address unique student needs.
• Coordination of professional learning activities, including those funded by Title II, occurs through the following activities:
o Individual schools conduct annual staff development surveys to determine staff development needs. A district comprehensive Staff Development Plan and consolidated planning coordinates all available district resources.
o Staff development within a school (including the use of Title I money) is coordinated through the SIP/Title I Plan and comprehensive needs assessment.
o Title I and II in-service is coordinated through Learning Support Services departmental curriculum staff.
o The Director of Federal and State Grants, Executive Director of Federal and State Grants and ELL, the Chief Academic Officer review the professional development allocations in the Title I plans and in the Title II project.
o Reading coaches receive ongoing professional development through their bi-monthly literacy team meetings. The teacher's individual plan (IPDP) is based upon an assessment of student learning needs, and this analysis of student achievement data in reading is essential to the creation of each teacher's professional development plan.
o The district will provide ongoing professional development and support for principals on classroom walk-through strategies, including how to give feedback to teachers.

Title III

Title III
Title I and Title III administrators have met to collaborate by providing Title I schools the optimum resources necessary to bring improve academic instruction. This has allowed them to maximize productivity while also eliminating duplicity of services, use of personnel and instructional materials. There are five major areas of collaboration: 1) tutoring, 2) teacher training, 3) parental involvement activities, 4) highly qualified personnel and 5) before and after school programs to address the needs of our most needy students in order to improve student achievement and development while meeting the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Upon reviewing and analyzing the English Language Learners' (ELLs) data, found key factors that prevented the District from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Among those factors are included two groups:
Group 1 presented the following challenges:
1) Lack of previous education or limited education,
2) Lack of literacy in heritage language
3) Lack of academic skills in ELLs' heritage language,
4) Lack of consistency in attending school in home country and/or in the United States, and
5) Lack of parental support in the home.
Group 2 presented the following challenges:
1) Uninterrupted education.
2) Average literacy in heritage language.
3) Less than average academic proficiency in heritage language.

4) Consistency in attending school, and
5) Some parental support in the home.
(See District School Improvement Plan for English Language Learners.)

Title X- Homeless

Title X- Homeless
The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
This is restricted funding which provides flexibility for school districts to use funds to help students gain at least a year of knowledge for each year in school. Strategies may include but are not limited to: high school summer school, extended day and extended year programs, class size reduction, and intervention programs.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs
The district, through the Safe and Drug Free Schools grant and based on gathered data, determined a list of needs. Target areas included lowering incidences of bullying (violence prevention) in the schools, lowering rates of alcohol, tobacco and other drug use among students, and the development of students' pro-social skills. To that end, programs such as Too Good for Drugs, Positive Behavior Support, Social Norming, and Guiding Good Choices have been selected for implementation in schools. Parents in the Title I schools are offered the Guiding Good Choices program led by the Title I Parent Involvement Specialist. Both Safe and Drug Free Schools and Drug Free Collier are working collaboratively to provide Guiding Good Choices classes for parents in the community. A Bullying Prevention Resource list is available on the district website.

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs: The District is offering breakfast at no charge to all students through the USDA Provision 2 breakfast program. All reduced students are receiving lunch at no charge. The NSLP Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program is being offered in twelve elementary schools. We are continuing to institute the OrganWise program through the University of Florida in qualifying elementary schools.

Housing Programs

Housing Programs - NA
The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

Head Start

Head Start: The Head Start Program in Collier County Public Schools serves 712 four-year-olds in targeted elementary sites based on the needs of the parents and students. The Head Start Program includes students identified for ESE services, Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) students, and students identified as Title I and Migrant. By coordinating efforts and funding, the all-encompassing Head Start Program is able to serve approximately 300 additional eligible students than the funding from Head Start alone supports.
Head Start provides comprehensive services to eligible families and their children. These comprehensive services include education, social services, parent involvement, and health services. These services are coordinated with the requirements of the other funding sources as a seamless service for parents and our 4-year-old students. The Head Start Program is a vital

part of our school community and these students are included in all academic and extra-curricular/enrichment programs as appropriate.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Career and Technical Education
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.
Career and Technical Education
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.

Job Training

Job Training
Students are offered Job Training programs through a variety of programs. All CE programs offer On-The-Job Training programs for situations where students are paid. Non-Paid opportunities are offered as Executive Internships. Students may also enroll for the Volunteer class which is offered in many school locations.
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 individualized instruction, 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.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Jose Hernandez (Principal), Melissa Rooney (AICE Advisor & Testing Coordinator), Rachel Dawes (Assistant Principal of Discipline), Dan Cox (Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Beth Colman (Director of Guidance), Katrina Duggan(Intervention Support Specialist), Sandy Consolino (Guidance Counselor), Deb Hoofer (Guidance Counselor), Joe Consolino (Guidance Counselor), Diane Krapf(Reading Coach), Kim Ragusa (Math Coach), Tara Bode (Science Coach), Joe Altruda(SIOP Coach), Scholastica Lee (Dean of Students).

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?

MTSS Leadership Team meets twice a month to discuss what information needs to be disseminated through Data Teams and to make any decisions on a leadership level that will affect the Data Team groups.
Data Teams are based on same or similar subject area teaching assignments. The Data Teacher Team uses the same Standards, Lesson Plans, Common Assessments and each team charts the data to make informed decisions regarding instruction, assessment, and interventions. Data Teams meet twice per month and work collaboratively to make decisions based on best practices.
The Leadership Team is facilitated by the Principal and co-facilitated by the Intervention Support Specialist. The APC, Guidance Counselors, and Academic Coaches bring student concerns to the meetings for review and the plan for next steps is determined and appropriate personnel are delegated tasks for completion. PMP's are created for Lowest Quartile students in Reading and Math, as well as other students as needed.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team under the leadership of the Intervention Support Specialist, reviewed FCAT data to align progress

monitoring criteria with the RtI model. The team collaborated using data on Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic, attendance, behavioral, and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction focusing on providing high quality rigorous instruction for all students. The team developed a flow chart and role responsibility chart to ensure successful implementation of our school improvement plan. Additionally, members of the team participate in, monitor, and support the teachers in their Data Team PLC's.

MTSS Implementation

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

Reading, Math, and Science: Data Warehouse is the system used to house the data on each student and PMPs are written to address the specific academic needs of a student. FAIR, FCAT, FAA, CELLA, Math, Science benchmark testing is all available in Data Warehouse. All students receive Tier 1 instruction as part of their school day. Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction is provided on an as needed basis according to student need.
Data Teams will also be collecting data on their common assessments and analyzing instructional strategies. This data will be charted and maintained throughout the school year by each Data Team and posted to the ANGEL Learning website.
Behavior: Student Pass is an intranet data system used for maintaining data and issuing the appropriate consequences for behavior. PMPs are maintained in our Data Warehouse Data Management system. Data Warehouse provides data charts of the success of an intervention once the teacher updates all of the data in the DW system.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

For the 2012-2013 school year 100% of staff completed the Direct Steps Training for MTSS. The MTSS process is in full implementation. Differentiated Instruction and RtI for Everyone is available for staff to complete online this school year. Professional Development during Early Release days for staff reflects training to support Data Teams, Formative Assessment, and Common Core Standards.
District Support is provided by the District Coordinator for MTSS/RtI as well as a school site Intervention Support Specialist. Ongoing training will be provided for our online data recording system, Data Warehouse, and the data needed for Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs).

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported by the district as well as through the school-based Intervention Support Specialist. Ongoing staff development will build teacher capacity in the implementation of the MTSS/RtI process. The Intervention Support Specialist will provide individual training as needed for teachers directly involved in the potential movement of a student from one Tier to another.The Intervention Support Specialists and the Academic Coaches collaborate to develop and support interventions in academic areas and PBS

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Diane Krapf, Reading/Literacy Coach
Joe Altruda, SIOP Coach and AP Spanish Teacher
Kim Ragusa, Math Coach and Math Department Chair
Tara Bode, Science Coach and Science Department Chair
Steve Anderson, AVID lead teacher and Social Studies teacher
Intensive Reading Teacher Grade-Level Representatives: Kristy Cassese (9th), Robert Wind (10th), Connie Mazgaj (11th), Beth Elledias (12th)

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

Ms. Krapf will serve as the chairperson. The team will meet monthly to collaborate on implementation of the literacy portions of the School Improvement Plan with particular focus on the district's Reading Coherence Model.

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

1. Implement and support the district's Reading Coherence Model

2. Implement and support close reading as a learning tool in all content areas
3. Implement and support the school's monthly instructional writing focus

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/11/2012)

*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.

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 teachers in Collier County Public Schools utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies, and The Reading Coherence Model, which 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 reading interventions 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?

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.

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?

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 postsecondary 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:	The percent of students scoring level 3 on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 23% to 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (150 students)	27% (231 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.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.	1a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will	1a.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.1. 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers.	1a.1. Teacher-made Pre/Post tests Common formative assessments Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Academic Coach Record Scales to Check for Understanding CTEM

			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.)			
2	1a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	1a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities in the form of Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly). AVID student-led conferences are held routinely.	1a.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.2. 2a. 6-Step Data Team Process for Results 2b. AVID strategies, close reading, student collaboration, Achieve 3000, use of FAIR data, DataWarehouse 2c. While content data teams meet in central location during common planning period, an administrator or academic coach is available to ask and answer questions focused on how the data is forming effective classroom instruction; On early release days, teachers meet with students individually to review their data.	1a.2. Data Team Documentation Quarterly assessment data Common formative assessment results DataWarehouse information (i.e., Student Snapshot) FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)
3	1a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS and RCM will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews.	1a.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.3. Observation of use of Pre-reading strategies, Cornell Notes, Higher-order questioning, and other research-based effective teaching strategies 3b. After professional learning opportunities and/or coaching, teachers will be asked to self-evaluate the impact of either/or on their teaching; evidence of use of a variety of authentic assessments to prove student mastery of content. 3c. Frequent checks for understanding including, but not limited to: Use of scales; Organized student discourse; written responses to	1a.3. Reading Coherence Model Higher-Order Thinking Question Stems (using Webb's Depth of Knowledge and/or Bloom's Taxonomy) Grade-level-or-above Close Reading material (such as AVID Weekly) THIEVES (and other pre-reading strategies) AVID strategies (i.e., Cornell Notes, Socratic Circles) Student interviews

		3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers in all content areas will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.		higher-order questions that cite evidence from the text; assessment results; increase in Lexile scores	FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Quarterly Assessment Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Reading proficiency by 5 raw points or 14 percentage points to 19%. The results of the 2011 FAA Reading Test indicate that 41 or 19 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4, 5 or 6 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:
14% are at current level of performance in this box.	19% are at expected level of performance in this box.

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 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 upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) Disscrete Trial Trainer My Reading Coaches CTEM

		challenges to increase motivation			
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 responses	1b.2. 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.	1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. .	1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
3	1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1b.3. 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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percent of students scoring above proficiency (level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 19% (124) to 21% (180).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (124 students)	21% (180 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2a.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.	2a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and	2a.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	2a.1. 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide	2a.1. Teacher-made Pre/Post tests Common formative assessments Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Academic Coach Record Scales to Check for Understanding

	1		assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 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.)		specific feedback to teachers.	CTEM
	2	2a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities in the form of Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly). AVID student-led conferences are held routinely.	2a.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	2a.2. 2a. 6-Step Data Team Process for Results 2b. AVID strategies, close reading, student collaboration, Achieve 3000, use of FAIR data, DataWarehouse 2c. While content data teams meet in central location during common planning period, an administrator or academic coach is available to ask and answer questions focused on how the data is forming effective classroom instruction; On early release days, teachers meet with students individually to review their data.	2a.2. Data Team Documentation Quarterly assessment data Common formative assessment results DataWarehouse information (i.e., Student Snapshot) FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)
		2a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific	2a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content,	2a.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	2a.3. Observation of use of Pre-reading strategies, Cornell Notes, Higher-order questioning, and other research-based effective teaching strategies	2a.3. Reading Coherence Model Higher-Order Thinking Question Stems (using Webb's Depth of

	strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS and RCM will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers in all content areas will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. Teachers will use “close reading” and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.		3b. After professional learning opportunities and/or coaching, teachers will be asked to self-evaluate the impact of either/or on their teaching; evidence of use of a variety of authentic assessments to prove student mastery of content. 3c. Frequent checks for understanding including, but not limited to: Use of scales; Organized student discourse; written responses to higher-order questions that cite evidence from the text; assessment results; increase in Lexile scores	Knowledge and/or Bloom’s Taxonomy) Grade-level-or-above Close Reading material (such as AVID Weekly) THIEVES (and other pre-reading strategies) AVID strategies (i.e., Cornell Notes, Socratic Circles) Student interviews FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Quarterly Assessment Data
3					

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 by 5 raw scores or 57 percentage points to 62%. The results of the 2011 FAA Reading Test indicate that 92 or 41 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7, 8 or 9 in reading proficiency. Note: Commended Level.s: Level 7 (99-110), Level 8 (111-126), Level 9 (127-144)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% is the current level of performance.	62% expected level of performance.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	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	2b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	2b.1. Progress Monitoring Data-collected through Pre-and Post-test Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	2b.2. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	2b2. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts.	2b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	2b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
3	2b.3 Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses.	2b.3 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	2b.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	2b.3 Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	2b.3 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:	The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading will increase from 65% (393) to 69% (555).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (393 students)	69% (555 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	3a.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	3a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 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.)	3a.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	3a.1. 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers.	3a.1. Teacher-made Pre/Post tests Common formative assessments Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Academic Coach Record Scales to Check for Understanding CTEM
2	3a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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	3a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities in the form of Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect	3a.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	3a.2. 2a. 6-Step Data Team Process for Results 2b. AVID strategies, close reading, student collaboration, Achieve 3000, use of FAIR data, DataWarehouse 2c. While content data	3a.2. Data Team Documentation Quarterly assessment data Common formative assessment results DataWarehouse information (i.e., Student Snapshot)

	not address individual student needs.	differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly). AVID student-led conferences are held routinely.		teams meet in central location during common planning period, an administrator or academic coach is available to ask and answer questions focused on how the data is forming effective classroom instruction; On early release days, teachers meet with students individually to review their data.	FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)
3	3a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS and RCM will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers in all content areas will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. Teachers will use “close reading” and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.	3a.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	3a.3. Observation of use of Pre-reading strategies, Cornell Notes, Higher-order questioning, and other research-based effective teaching strategies 3b. After professional learning opportunities and/or coaching, teachers will be asked to self-evaluate the impact of either/or on their teaching; evidence of use of a variety of authentic assessments to prove student mastery of content. 3c. Frequent checks for understanding including, but not limited to: Use of scales; Organized student discourse; written responses to higher-order questions that cite evidence from the text; assessment results; increase in Lexile scores	3a.3. Reading Coherence Model Higher-Order Thinking Question Stems (using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge and/or Bloom’s Taxonomy) Grade-level-or-above Close Reading material (such as AVID Weekly) THIEVES (and other pre-reading strategies) AVID strategies (i.e., Cornell Notes, Socratic Circles) Student interviews FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Quarterly Assessment Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Reading scores indicate that 4 % of the students made learning gains.

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 the students achieving learning gains by five percentage point to 9 %. NOTE: Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Commended Level: Level 7 (99-110), Level 8 (111-126), Level 9 (127-144) Achieved Level: 4 (63-69), Level 5(70-84), Level 6 (85-98) Emergent Level: 1(0-25), Level 2(25-40), Level 3 (40-62.)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% are at current level of performance.	9% are expected to reach this 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	3b.1. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses.	3b.1. 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.	3b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team , IEP Team Members	3b.1. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	3b.1. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
2	3b.2. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	3b.2. 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	3b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	3b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	3b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
3	3b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information.	3b.3 Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions,	3b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members	3b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	3b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons

		and analyze information in graphs/charts.			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:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percent of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading will increase from 74% (111) to 77% (2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (111 students)	77% (2 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.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.	4a.1. 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that LG is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-	4a.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	4a.1. 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers.	4a.1. Teacher-made Pre/Post tests Common formative assessments Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Academic Coach Record Scales to Check for Understanding CTEM

		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.)			
2	4a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	4a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities in the form of Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly). AVID student-led conferences are held routinely.	4a.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	4a.2. 2a. 6-Step Data Team Process for Results 2b. AVID strategies, close reading, student collaboration, Achieve 3000, use of FAIR data, DataWarehouse 2c. While content data teams meet in central location during common planning period, an administrator or academic coach is available to ask and answer questions focused on how the data is forming effective classroom instruction; On early release days, teachers meet with students individually to review their data.	4a.2. Data Team Documentation Quarterly assessment data Common formative assessment results DataWarehouse information (i.e., Student Snapshot) FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)
3	4a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	4a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the RCM, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the CCS and RCM will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as lesson study	4a.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	4a.3. 3a. Observation of use of Pre-reading strategies, Cornell Notes, Higher-order questioning, and other research-based effective teaching strategies 3b. After professional learning opportunities and/or coaching, teachers will be asked to self-evaluate the impact of either/or on their teaching; evidence of use of a variety of authentic assessments to prove student mastery of content. 3c. Frequent checks for understanding including, but not limited to: Use of scales; Organized student discourse; written responses to higher-order questions that cite evidence from the text;	4a.3. Reading Coherence Model Higher-Order Thinking Question Stems (using Webb's Depth of Knowledge and/or Bloom's Taxonomy) Grade-level-or-above Close Reading material (such as AVID Weekly) THIEVES (and other pre-reading strategies) AVID strategies (i.e., Cornell Notes, Socratic Circles) Student interviews FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)

		and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers in all content areas will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.		assessment results; increase in Lexile scores	Quarterly Assessment Data

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
		43%	45%	47%	49%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percent of students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading in ethnic subgroups will increase as follows: White: from 59% (75) to 63% (89) Black: from 34% (48) tp 41% (75) Hispanic: from 40% (143) to 46% (228) Asian: from 75% (3) to 78% (6) American Indian: from 0 (0%) to 10% (1)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 59% (75 sudents) Black: 34% (48 students) Hispanic: 40% (143 students) Asian: 75% (3 students) American Indian: 0% (0 students)	White: 63% (89 students) Black: 41% (75 students) Hispanic: 46% (228 students) Asian: 78% (6 students) American Indian: 10% (1 student)

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
	5B.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/	5B.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments.	5B.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5B.1. 1a. Teacher will post a mini-assessment grade a minimum of once every two weeks, and then teacher will generate a report from Gradebook	5B.1. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data

	1	benchmark. 5B.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. Teacher will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factors (i.e., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) to tailor instruction to individual students' needs.	Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. Teacher will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factors (i.e., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) to tailor instruction to individual students' needs.		that identifies performance by subgroup, and then teacher will scaffold instruction to close any identified learning gaps. 1b. Teacher will check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning of all ethnic groups; 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 from various ethnic groups to determine understanding of the LG and scale. (See CTEM alignment.) 1c. Teacher will use information from individual conferences to differentiate instruction for ethnic groups requiring additional scaffolding.	FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Scales to Check for Understanding
	2	5B.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	5B.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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.	5B.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5B.2. 2a. Using Gradebook and anecdotal observations, teacher will monitor student progress by ethnic subgroup. 2b. Teacher monitors collaborative activities to ensure participation from all ethnic subgroups. 2c. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify	5B.2. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) CTEM observations

		2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will review data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group.		appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	
3	5B.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	5B.3. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. As needs are identified, teacher will provide additional scaffolding to ensure all ethnic groups have the opportunity to expand their knowledge base by being able to access the text.	5B.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5B.3. 3a. Implementation of additional scaffolding including, but not limited to, Building Background Knowledge and Vocabulary instruction	5B.3. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) CTEM observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percent of English Language Learners (ELL) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 29% (101) to 36% (60).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (101 students)	36% (60 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5C.1. Rigor 1.Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark. 2. Oftentimes ELL students' language level is below grade level expectations and impedes students' mastery of the curriculum.	5C.1. 1a. 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded	5C.1. SIOP Coach; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5C.1. 1a. Teacher will post a mini-assessment grade a minimum of once every two weeks, and then teacher will generate a report from Gradebook that identifies performance by subgroup, and then teacher will scaffold instruction to close any identified learning gaps. 1b. Teacher will check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-	5C.1. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) CELLA results Scales to Check for Understanding

1		standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. Teacher will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to students' needs.		order questioning; 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.) 1c. Teacher will use ELL strategies to optimize students' language acquisition.	
2	5C.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	5C.2. 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	5C.2. SIOP Coach; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5C.2. 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments across the content areas, including but not limited to formative, summative and performance-based assessments 2b. Utilize content area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan for next steps. 2c. Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.	5C.2. Data Chats (with students) Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data CELLA and FAIR data CTEM observations
3	5C.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	5C.3. 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	5C.3. SIOP Coach; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5C.3. 3a. Utilize a variety of assessments across the content areas, including but not limited to formative, summative and performance-based assessments Include short and extended response opportunities for students to integrate writing to explain their thinking. 3b. Utilize agree upon, research-based effective teaching strategies. Support teachers through content area observation and modeling of ELL Strategies.	5C.3. Student work Quarterly assessment data CELLA and FAIR results Student interviews 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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading will increase from 28% (20) to 35% (31).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (20 students)	35% (31 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.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.	5D.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. 1c. Teacher 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).	5D.1. ESE Inclusion teacher; IEP Case Worker; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5D.1. 1a. Teacher will post a mini-assessment grade a minimum of once every two weeks, and then teacher will scaffold instruction to close any identified learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Teacher will collaborate with co-teacher to provide effective instruction to students with disabilities.	5D.1. IEP Progress Reports Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Scales to Check for Understanding
2	5D.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	5D.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacherwill	5D.2. ESE Inclusion teacher; IEP Case Worker; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5D.2. 2a. Teacher will ensure participation of SWD students in collaborative activities. 2b. Teacher will maintain high expectations of SWD students to participate fully in collaborative activities. 2c. Teacher will collaborate with co-teacher to provide effective instruction to students with disabilities.	5D.2. IEP Progress Reports Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)

		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).			
3	5D.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	5D.3. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher 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 .	5D.3. ESE Inclusion teacher; IEP Case Worker; Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5D.3. 3a. Teacher will maintain high expectations of SWD students to participate fully in collaborative activities. 3b. Teacher will collaborate with co-teacher to provide effective instruction to students with disabilities.	5D.3. IEP Progress Reports Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percent of economically disadvantaged students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in Reading will increase from 39% (199) to 45% (302).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (199 students)	45% (302 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5E.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.	5E.1. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. 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 this subgroup. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify	5E.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5E.1. 1a. Teacher will post a mini-assessment grade a minimum of once every two weeks, and then teacher will generate a report from Gradebook that identifies performance by this subgroup, and then teacher will scaffold instruction to close any identified learning gaps. 1b. Teacher will check student level of	5E.1. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) Scales to Check for Understanding

1		levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. Teacher will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factors (i.e., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) to tailor instruction to individual students' needs.		understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning of ED students; 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. 1c. Teacher will use information from individual conferences to differentiate instruction for ED students requiring additional scaffolding.	
2	5E.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	5E.2. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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 this subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for this group. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will review data by this subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the subgroup.	5E.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5E.2. 2a. Using Gradebook and anecdotal observations, teacher will monitor student progress by this subgroup. 2b. Teacher monitors collaborative activities to ensure participation from this subgroup. 2c. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	5E.2. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) CTEM observations
3	5E.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	5E.3. *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. As needs are identified, teacher will provide additional scaffolding to ensure ED students have the opportunity to expand their knowledge base by being able to access the text.	5E.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	5E.3. 3a. Implementation of additional scaffolding including, but not limited to, Building Background Knowledge and Vocabulary instruction	5E.3. Mini-assessments Gradebook reports Quarterly Assessment Data FAIR and Achieve 3000 results (FCAT Levels 1 and 2) 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
Data Team Training- operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School-wide	Teacher Pre Service Week	Monitor 2x month data team mtgs.	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Test Item Specification and they relate to Power Standards, appropriate level of rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to use.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School-wide	Teacher Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring CTEM iObservation	Administration CTEM Teachers Academic Coaches Data Teams
Reading Coherence Model	Grades 9-12	Diane Krapf	School-wide	Sept. 17 ER Day	Academic Coaching support; Data Team collaboration; CTEM Observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and your classroom	Grades 9-12	Irene Benfatti and Erin O'Guinn	School wide	Sept. 26 ER Day	Data Team monitoring CTEM iObservation	Administration CTEM Teachers Academic Coaches Data Teams
UNIQUE Curriculum Training	Grades 9-12	CCPS ESE	Self Contained teachers	Ongoing throuout 2012-2013	Data Team monitoring CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Marzano Training on Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Teacher Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring CTEM iObservation	Administration CTEM Teachers Academic Coaches Data Teams
Close Reading	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez; Academic Coaches	School-wide	Pre Service Week; ER Days; Inservice Days	Academic Coaching support; Data Team Collaboration; CTEM observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Intertextual Triads	Grades 9-12	Principal; Academic Coaches	School-wide	ER Days; Inservice Days	Academic Coaching support; Data Team collaboration; CTEM observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Achieve 3000	Grades 9-10 Intensive Reading and Grades 9-12 Intensive Language Arts	Diane Krapf; Rebecca Merhar	9th and 10th grade intensive reading teachers and ILA teacher; reading/literacy coach	October 11, 2012	Academic Coaching support; Achieve Usage/Performance data; CTEM observations	Administration Reading/Literacy Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After School Tutoring & Homework Help	Language Arts/Reading teacher will be provided for the after school program	SAC School Improvement Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in Listening & Speaking by 3%, from 35% (78) to 38%(81).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
35% (78)	

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. 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	Teacher, SIOP Coach, Reading Coach	Teachers will 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 to determine additional supports that may be needed to improve oral language skills of identified ELL learners.	Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

1		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 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.		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.	

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:	The percentage of students scoring proficient in Reading will increase 1%, from 12%(27) to 13%(28).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
12%(27)	

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	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 reading assessments.	Teacher, SIOP Coach, Reading Coach	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. 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.	Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in Writing by 1%, from 15%(33) to 16%(34).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
15%(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	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 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.	Teacher, SIOP Coach, Reading Coach	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.	Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide SIOP program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use		

.5 - ELL SIOP Coach	SIOP-based ELL learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to SIOP strategies as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups, such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$43,282.00
			Subtotal: $43,282.00

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: $43,282.00

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 by 5 raw scores or 57 percentage points to 62%. 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 (58-69), Level 5 (70-91), Level 6 (92-98)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% are at current level of performance.	62% will reach 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	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.	1.1. 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	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	1.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses	1.2. 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	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	1.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM

		c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation.			
3	1.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving and interpreting information.	1.3. a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP goals into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1.3. 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:	
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 by 5 raw scores or 29 percentage points to 34%. 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 (99-108), Level 8 (109-129), Level 9 (130-144)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% for current level of performance.	34% is the 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	2.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	2.1. 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	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	2.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2.1. 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			
2	2.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	2.2. 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.	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	2.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	2.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
3	2.3 Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving and interpreting information.	2.3 a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP goals into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction.	2.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team members.	2.3 Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2.3 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:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Math scores indicate that 20 % of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students achieving learning gains by five percentage point to 25 %. NOTE: The results of the 2011 FAA (District) Math Test indicate that 171 or 66 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4-9 in math at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4 (58-62), Level 5 (70-91), Level 6 (92-98); Commended Level: Level 7 (99-108), Level 8 (109-129), Level 9 (130-144
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

86 % are a current level of performance.	91% is expected to increase their 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	3.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	3.1. 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	3.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	3.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	3.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	3.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	3.2. 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.	3.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	3.2. Based on observations, the use of a variety of communication tools are evident and incorporated into daily lessons differentiated for group and individual student needs	3. 2 Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
3	3.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving and interpreting information.	3.3. a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP goals into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction.	3.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	3.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	3.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) 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:	The percent of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 31% (86) to 37% (150).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (86)	37% (150)

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: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal 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. 1b. 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. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that the learning goal is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the learning goal and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the learning goal and scale. (See CTEM alignment.)	1.1 Academic Coaches, District Staff, Principal, APC	1.1 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers.	1.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Academic Coach Record Cornell Notes Exit Tickets Check for Understanding CTEM

2	1.2 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.	1.2 2a. Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent. AVID Student-Led Conferences are held routinely. 2c. During Data Team meetings, teacher will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension, acceleration or intervention.	1.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.2 2a. Meet with content data teams to analyze data. 2b. Implement Data Chats for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing data. Revisit data periodically to determine if goal has been met. 2c. Review and use data to drive instructional process and help provide enrichment or interventions activities that support mastery of benchmarks.	1.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Common Formative Assessments Data Team Meetings Data Chats
3	1.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies or the Literacy Coherence Model across all content, seeking to incorporate text to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the literacy coherence model, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the Collaborative Comprehension Strategies will be evident in through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks.Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word	1.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	1.3 3a. Utilize agreed upon, research based effective strategies. 3b. Participate in Professional Development opportunities to establish best practices for math instruction. 3c. Utilize agree upon research based reading strategies. 3d. Check student's level of understanding through discourse and higher order questioning.	1.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Close Reading THIEVES HOTS Check for 3 Agile Mind Professional Development

		problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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:	The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 5% (13) to 5% (20).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (13)	5% (20)

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	2.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	2.1 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal 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. 1b. 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. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that the learning goal 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 learning goal and scale. (See CTEM alignment.)	2.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	2.1 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers.	2.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Academic Coach Record Cornell Notes Exit Tickets Check for Understanding CTEM

2	2.2 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.	2.2 2a. Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent. AVID Student-Led Conferences are held routinely. 2c. During Data Team meetings, teacher will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension, acceleration or intervention.	2.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	2a. Meet with content data teams to analyze data. 2b. Implement Data Chats for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing data. Revisit data periodically to determine if goal has been met. 2c. Review and use data to drive instructional process and help provide enrichment or interventions activities that support mastery of benchmarks.	2.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Common Formative Assessments Data Team Meetings Data Chats
3	2.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension	2.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies or the Literacy Coherence Model across all content, seeking to incorporate text to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the Literacy Coherence Model, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the Collaborative Comprehension Strategies will be evident through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks.Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend,	2.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	2.3 3a. Utilize agreed upon, research based effective strategies. 3b. Participate in Professional Development opportunities to establish best practices for math instruction. 3c. Utilize agree upon research based reading strategies. 3d. check student's level of understanding through discourse and higher order questioning.	2.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Close Reading THIEVES HOTS Check for 3 Agile Mind Professional Development

		represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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:	The percent of students not making satisfactory progess on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC in each ethnic subgroup will increase as follows: White 52% (25) to 57% (35) Black 31% (16) to 38% (38) Hispanic 32% (53) to 39% (90) Asian 100% (1) to 0% (0) American Indian 100% (1) to 100% (6)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 52% (25) Black 31% (16) Hispanic 32% (53) Asian 100% (1) American Indian 100% (1)	White 57% (35) Black 38% (38) Hispanic 39% (90) Asian 0% American Indian 100% (6)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3B.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3B.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. During daily	3B.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Set goals with student and review individual student data.	3B.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Chats

			guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further instruction. 1c. Teacher 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	3B.2 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.	3B.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher 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.	3B.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Collect data using Data Warehouse	3B.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse
3	3B.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3B.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will maintain data by sub-group in	3B.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Collect data using Data Warehouse	3B.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse

		order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.			

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:	The percent of English Language Learners (ELL) making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 27% (41) to 34% (32).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (41)	34% (32)

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	3C.1 Instructional: Lessons do no routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	3C.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. During daily guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further nstruction. 1c. Teacher will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background	3C.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3C.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Set goal with student and review individual student data.	3C.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Chats

		knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.			
2	3C.2 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.	3C.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	3C.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, SIOP Coach	3C.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Utilize SIOP strategies in class.	3C.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Sheltered ELL classes SIOP Trained teachers SIOP Coach
3	3C.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3C.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	3C.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, SIOP Coach	3C.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Utilize SIOP strategies in class	3C.3 Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Sheltered ELL classes SIOP Trained teachers SIOP Coach

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:	The percent of Students wit Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 9% (3) to 18% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

9% (3)	18% (9)

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	3D.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3D.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. 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. 1c. Teacher 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 to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	3D.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, Inclusion Teachers	3D.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Provide ESE support to assist students in mastery of standards/benchmarks.	3D.1 Quarterly Assessment Data ESE Inclusion Model Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model
2	3D.2 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.	3D.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will accomodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading and math skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	3D.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3D.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Utilize ESE inclusion teacher to develop strategies to support reading, writing and math skills in classroom.	3D.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model

3	3D.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension	3D.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading and math skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	3D.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3D.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Utilize ESE inclusion teacher to develop strategies to support reading, writing and math skills in classroom.	3D.3 Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model

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:	The percent of Economically Disadvantages students making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 34% (74) to 41% (135).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (74)	41% (135)

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
	3E.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3E.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions	3E.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check level of understanding through discussion and higher order questioning. 1c. Set goals with student and review individual student data.	3E.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Chats

1		necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark.During daily guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further instruction. 1c. Teacher 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	3E.2 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.	3E.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher 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, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	3E.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.2 2a. Utilize a variety of asssessments including formative, summative and performance based.	3E.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse
	3E.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3E.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities	3E.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher order questioning. 3b. Collect data from Data Warehouse.	3E.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK

3		and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher 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, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.			Data Warehouse

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:	The percent of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will be 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	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	1.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	1.1 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal 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. 1b. 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	1.1 Academic Coaches, District Staff, Principal, APC	1.1 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers	1.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Academic Coach Record Cornell Notes Exit Tickets Check for Understanding CTEM

		successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that the learning goal is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the learning goal and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the learning goal and scale. (See CTEM alignment.)			
2	1.2 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.	1.2 2a. Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent. AVID Student-Led Conferences are held routinely. 2c. During Data Team meetings, teacher will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension, acceleration or intervention.	1.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.2 2a. Meet with content data teams to analyze data. 2b. Implement Data Chats for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing data. Revisit data periodically to determine if goal has been met. 2c. Review and use data to drive instructional process and help provide enrichment or interventions activities that support mastery of benchmarks.	1.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Common Formative Assessments Data Team Meetings Data Chats
3	1.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies or the Literacy Coherence Model across all content, seeking to incorporate text to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the literacy coherence model, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the Collaborative Comprehension Strategies will be evident in through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments	1.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	1.3 3a. Utilize agreed upon, research based effective strategies. 3b. Participate in Professional Development opportunities to establish best practices for math instruction. 3c. Utilize agree upon research based reading strategies. 3d. Check student's level of understanding through discourse and higher order questioning.	1.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Close Reading THIEVES HOTS Check for 3 Agile Mind Professional Development

		to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks.Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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:	The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will be 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	5%

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	2.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	2.1 1a.Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal 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. 1b. 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	2.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	2.1 1a. Utilize academic coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan next steps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Conduct walk-throughs and observations to provide specific feedback to teachers	2.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Academic Coach Record Cornell Notes Exit Tickets Check for Understanding CTEM

		successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 1c. During classroom observations administrators will determine that the learning goal 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 learning goal and scale. (See CTEM alignment.)			
2	2.2 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.	2.2 2a. Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent. AVID Student-Led Conferences are held routinely. 2c. During Data Team meetings, teacher will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension, acceleration or intervention.	2.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	2a. Meet with content data teams to analyze data. 2b. Implement Data Chats for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing data. Revisit data periodically to determine if goal has been met. 2c. Review and use data to drive instructional process and help provide enrichment or interventions activities that support mastery of benchmarks.	2.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Common Formative Assessments Data Team Meetings Data Chats
3	2.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension	2.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies or the Literacy Coherence Model across all content, seeking to incorporate text to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. *Note: in using the literacy coherence model, consider that text drives the selection of strategies for accessing the text. There will be times when the recommended strategy/benchmark is not appropriate to the text. Use of the Collaborative Comprehension Strategies will be evident in through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop	2.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, District Staff	2.3 3a. Utilize agreed upon, research based effective strategies. 3b. Participate in Professional Development opportunities to establish best practices for math instruction. 3c. Utilize agree upon research based reading strategies. 3d. check student's level of understanding through discourse and higher order questioning.	2.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Close Reading THIEVES HOTS Check for 3 Agile Mind Professional Development

		formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks.Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. (See CTEM alignment.) 3d. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate, using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories.			

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:	The percent of students not making satisfactory progess on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC in each ethnic subgroup will be as follows: White 42% Black 21% Hispanic 22% Asian 90% American Indian 90%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	White 42% Black 21% Hispanic 22% Asian 90% American Indian 90%

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
	3B.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and	3B.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups,	3B.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps.	3B.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding

1	assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. During daily guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further instruction. 1c. Teacher 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.		1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Set goals with student and review individual student data.	Webb's DOK Data Chats
2	3B.2 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.	3B.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the	3B.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Collect data using Data Warehouse	3B.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse

		sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.			
3	3B.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3B.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher 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, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	3B.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3B.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Collect data using Data Warehouse	3B.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse

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:	The percent of English Language Learners (ELL) making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will be 17%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	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
	3C.1 Instructional: Lessons do no routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	3C.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks using mini-assessments.	3C.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3C.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	3C.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Chats

1		Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. During daily guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further nstruction. 1c. Teacher 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.		1c. Set goal with student and review individual student data.	
2	3C.2 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.	3C.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	3C.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, SIOP Coach	3C.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Utilize SIOP strategies in class.	3C.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Sheltered ELL classes SIOP Trained teachers SIOP Coach
	3C.3 Instructional: Content	3C.3 *See Strategies from	3C.3 Principal, APC,	3C.3 3a. Check student level	3C.3 Check for

3	instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Academic Coaches, SIOP Coach	of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Utilize SIOP strategies in class	Understanding Webb's DOK Sheltered ELL classes SIOP Trained teachers SIOP Coach

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:	The percent of Students wit Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra EOC will be 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	5%

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	3D.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3D.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. 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. 1c. Teacher 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	3D.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches, Inclusion Teachers	3D.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 1c. Provide ESE support to assist students in mastery of standards/benchmarks.	3D.1 Quarterly Assessment Data ESE Inclusion Model Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model

		plans to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.			
2	3D.2 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.	3D.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher will accomodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading and math skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices	3D.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3D.2 2a. Utilize a variety of assessments including formative, summative and performance based. 2b. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 2c. Utilize ESE inclusion teacher to develop strategies to support reading, writing and math skills in classroom.	3D.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model
3	3D.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension	3D.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading and math skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	3D.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3D.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. 3b. Utilize ESE inclusion teacher to develop strategies to support reading, writing and math skills in classroom.	3D.3 Check for Understanding Webb's DOK ESE Inclusion Model

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:	The percent of Economically Disadvantages students making satisfactory progress on the 2013 Algebra 1 EOC will be 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No Baseline Data	24%
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	3E.1 Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/ benchmark.	3E.1 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 1a. For all sub-groups, provide leveled instruction as appropriate. 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. 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark.During daily guided practice, students will indicate their progress toward the learning goal through a check for understanding that will guide further instruction. 1c. Teacher 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.	3E.1 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.1 1a. Teacher will sort assessment results by sub-group and evaluate for learning gaps. 1b. Check level of understanding through discussion and higher order questioning. 1c. Set goals with student and review individual student data.	3E.1 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Chats
2	3E.2 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.	3E.2 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 2a. 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. 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate	3E.2 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.2 2a. Utilize a variety of asssessments including formative, summative and performance based.	3E.2 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehouse

		in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 2c. Teacher 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, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.			
3	3E.3 Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	3E.3 *See Strategies from Leveled Groups previously mentioned 3a. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. 3b. Teacher 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, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	3E.3 Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	3E.3 3a. Check student level of understanding through discussion and higher order questioning. 3b. Collect data from Data Warehouse.	3E.3 Quarterly Assessment Data Check for Understanding Webb's DOK Data Warehous

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
e2020 Math Intervention training	grades 9-10	CCPS Math Personnel	Teachers of 9th and 10th grade Algebra I	Sept 9	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation APC monitors e2020 weekly report	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Data Team						

Training-operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School wide	Pre Service week	Monitor 2x month	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Test Item Specification and how they relate to Power Standards, appropriate levels of Rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to utilize.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and your classroom	Grades 9-12	Irene Benfatti and Erin O'Guinn	School wide	Sept. 26 ER Day	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
UNIQUE Curriculum Training	Grades 9-12	CCPS ESE	Self Contained ESE Teachers	Ongoing throughout 2012-2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Agile Minds Algebra I training	9th grade	CCPS Math Personnel	Teachers of 9th grade Algebra I and Academic COach	Pre Service week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Marzano Training on High Yield Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team
Agile Minds Algebra I training for all Math Teachers (aimed at Common Core Standards)	Grades 9-12	Kim Ragusa	GGH Math Teachers	Pre Service Week	Monitor Data Teams	Administration Academic Math Coach Data Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After School Tutoring & Homework Help	Mathematics teacher will be provided for the after school program	SAC School Improvement Funds	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.0 - Math Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide numeracy program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use mathematics-based learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' math literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to math strategies as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups, such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$60,576.00
			Subtotal: $60,576.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $63,576.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Math proficiency by 5 raw scores or 56 percentage points to 61%. NOTE: The results of the 2012 FAA (District) Science Test indicate that 35 or 32 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4-6 in Science at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4 (59-71), Level 5 (72-83), Level 6 (84-102)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% current level of performance in this box.	61% are expected to increase 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
	1.1. Data-driven planning	1.1. Provide UDL based	1.1. Principal,	1.1. Progress Monitoring	1.1. Unique Learning

1	for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	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	Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	1.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	1.2. 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.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	1.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
3	1.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, and interpreting information	1.3. Provide scaffolded instruction with the use of pictures and text features to support comprehension in the areas of scientific inquiry, such as: asking questions, making predictions and communicating findings.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1.3. 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:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Math proficiency by 5 raw scores or 22 percentage points to 27%. 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:
22% are at level of performance.	27% is the 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	2.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points.	2.1. 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	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	2.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM
2	2.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses.	2.2. 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.	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team	2.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	2.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
3	2.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, and interpreting information	2.3. Provide scaffolded instruction with the use of pictures and text features to support comprehension in the areas of scientific inquiry, such as: asking questions, making predictions and communicating	2.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	2.3 Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	2.3 Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals,

		findings.			Preferences, Skills (GPS) 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:	The percentage of students achieving proficiency in science will increase 10% (44).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%(130)	45%(143)

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 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.	1.1 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.1 1a.Utilize content area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief and discuss observations and plan for next steps. 1b. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. 1c. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. 1d. Utilize agreed upon, reseach-based effective teaching strategies.	1.1 Quarterly Assessment Data, Assessments-formative and summative, EOCs, FCAT, Learning Goals and Scales to determine levels of understanding, CTEM, Administrators' observations, Lesson plans, Students' notebooks/journals/exit tickets

1		embedded standards/benchmarks. 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 is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. 1d. 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. 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.			
2	1.2 Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	1.2 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. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly).	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.2 2a. Meet with grade level data teams to analyze data and test items from common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect data monitoring. 2b. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. 2c. Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual student's data. Revisit data with students monthly or quarterly to determine if their goal has been met.	1.2 Quarterly Assessment Data, Assessments-formative and summative, EOCs, FCAT, PLC notes, Lesson plans, CTEM, Administrators' observations
	1.3 Use of Informational	1.3 3a. Content area	Principal, APC, Academic	1.3 3a. Utilize agreed	1.3 Lesson plans, CTEM,

3	Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS)and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. 3d. 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.	Coaches	upon, research-based effective teaching strategies. 3b.Utilize content-area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief and discuss observations and plan for next steps. 3c. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. 3d. Implement and provide feedback for science journals/notebooks/ exit tickets.	Administrators observations, Students' notebooks/journals/exit tickets

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:	The percentage of students achieving proficiency in science will increase 10% (44).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (74)	30% (81)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	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.	1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the 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. 1b. Teachers will use LGs with accompanying scales to identify levels of performance relative to the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the LG and its embedded standards/benchmarks. 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 is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. 1d. Students will be expected to set a goal for acheiving a score of mastery 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,	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.1 1a.Utilize content area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief and discuss observations and plan for next steps. 1b. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. 1c. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. 1d. Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual students' data. Revisit data with students monthly or quarterly to determine if their goal has been met.	1.1 Quarterly Assessment Data, Assessments-formative and summative, EOCs, FCAT, Learning Goals and Scales to determine levels of understanding, CTEM, Administrators' observations, Lesson plans, Students' notebooks/journals/exit tickets

		students must reference a minimum of 2 outside sources to either support or refute the students' conclusions. TE will provide scaffolded support in order to develop students' ability to successfully meet this expectation.				
2	1.2 Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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.	1.2 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. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly).	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.2 2a. Meet with grade level data teams to analyze data and test items from common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect data monitoring. 2b. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. 2c. Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual student's data. Revisit data with students monthly or quarterly to determine if their goal has been met.	1.2 Quarterly Assessment Data, Assessments-formative and summative, EOCs, FCAT, PLC notes, Lesson plans, CTEM, Administrators' observations
3	1.3 Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1.3 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS)and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.3 3a. Utilize agreed upon, research-based effective teaching strategies. 3b.Utilize content-area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief and discuss observations and plan for next steps. 3c. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. 3d. Implement and provide feedback for science journals/notebooks/ exit tickets.	1.3 Lesson plans, CTEM, Administrators observations, Students' notebooks/journals/exit tickets

		levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. 3d. 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.			

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
Data Team Training-operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School wide	Pre Service Week	Monitor 2 x month at Data Team Mtgs.	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team
Test Item Specification and how they relate to Power Standards, appropriate levels of Rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to utilize.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team
STEM support across the Curriculum	Grades 9-12	Tara Bode and Kim Ragusa	School Wide	November & December 2012 during teacher planning	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team
Marzano Training on						

High Yield Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Pre Service week.	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team
UNIQUE Curriculum Training	Grades 9-12	CCPS ESE Personnel	Self contained ESE teachers	2012-2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and your classroom	Grades 9-12	Irene Benfatti and Erin O'Guinn	School wide	Sept. 26 ER Day	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Science Coach Data Team

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
1.0 - Science Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide literacy program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use literacy-based learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to literacy as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups, such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$46,870.00
			Subtotal: $46,870.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $46,870.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The percent of students achieving proficiency on 2013 FCAT Writing (3.0 or higher) will increase from 76% (250) to 84% (350).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (250 students)	84% (350 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.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.	1a.1. 1a. To ensure rigorous expectations for 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. 1b. 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. 1c. 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.	1a.1. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.1. 1a. Student analytical writing will be reviewed for evidence of critical thinking and supporting evidence from the text (s). 1b. Student portfolio work will be reviewed as part of the CTEM observation process; evaluators will confirm "Check for 3" sign is visible in classroom as reinforcement for students. 1c. Student portfolio work will be reviewed as part of the CTEM observation process for evidence of revision based on teacher feedback.	1a.1. Baseline and End of Quarter Writing Prompts Monthly Instructional Writing Focus FCAT Rubric Student Writing Portfolios Webb's Depth of Knowledge AVID Weekly (and other sources of close reading material) Intertextual Triads
2	1a.2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction 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	1a.2. 2a. Professional Learning Communities in the form of Data Teams will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. Completion of Data Team Template will reflect critical analyses. 2b. Lesson plans and instruction will reflect differentiated	1a.2. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.2. 2a. 6-Step Data Team Process for Results 2b. Teacher will conference with students frequently to provide feedback and suggestions for improving writing. 2c. Student writing will show progressive improvement in: focus and purpose; logical progression of	1a.2. Baseline and End of Quarter Writing Prompts Monthly Instructional Writing Focus FCAT Rubric Student Writing Portfolios Webb's Depth of Knowledge

	student needs.	instruction based on careful data analysis. 2c. School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly). AVID student-led conferences are held routinely.		ideas; effective use of transitional devices; development of support; use of creative writing strategies; use of mature and expressive language; varied sentence structure; use of correct conventions in mechanics, usage, punctuation, and spelling	AVID Weekly (and other sources of close reading material) Intertextual Triads
3	1a.3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	1a.3. 3a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Use of the CCS and RCM will be evident in lesson plans, through observation and student interviews. 3b. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as lesson study and/or coaching support to develop formal and informal assessments to monitor individual student progress and mastery of the cognitive complexity levels of taught standards/benchmarks. 3c. Teachers in all content areas will utilize consistent reading and writing scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. Teachers will use “close reading” and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading and analytical writing.	1a.3. Principal and other CTEM evaluators; academic coaches	1a.3. 3a. Observation of use of rigorous, multiple texts for close reading followed by analytical writing that demonstrates higher-order thinking and cites evidence from the text (s). 3b. After professional learning opportunities and/or coaching, teachers will be asked to self-evaluate the impact of either/or on their teaching; evidence of use of a variety of authentic assessments to prove student mastery of content. 3c. Frequent checks for understanding including, but not limited to: Use of scales; Organized student discourse; written responses to higher-order questions that cite evidence from the text; assessment results; increase in Lexile scores	1a.3. Baseline and End of Quarter Writing Prompts Monthly Instructional Writing Focus FCAT Rubric Student Writing Portfolios Webb’s Depth of Knowledge AVID Weekly (and other sources of close reading material) Intertextual Triads

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:	
	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Writing proficiency by 5 raw scores or 67 percentage points to 72%.

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	NOTE: The results of the 2012 FAA (District) Writing Test indicate that 42 or 50 % of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4-9 in Writing at the proficient level. Raw scores for proficiency are as follows: Achieved Level: Level 4(64-(71), Level 5 (72-86), Level 6 (87-98) Commended Level: Level 7 (99-111), Level 8 (112-125), Level 9 (126-144)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% is the current level of performance.	72% is the 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	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	1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments	1b.1. 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.	1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs.	1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM
	1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information for a	1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in the use of text features focused on:	1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic	1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark	1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark

3	structured approach to support writing and representing/interpreting information.	writing conventions of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members	Assessments	Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) 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
Test Item Specification and how they relate to Power Standards, appropriate levels of Rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to utilize.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School wide	Pre Service week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
Marzano Training on High Yield Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
Monthly Writing Focus	Grades 9-12	Principal, APC, academic coaches	School-wide	ER Days, Inservice Days, Data Team Meetings	Academic Coaching Support; Data Team Collaboration; CTEM observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Student Writing Portfolios showing evidence of revision over time	Grades 9-12	Principal, Academic Coaches	School-wide	Pre Service Week	Academic Coaching support; Data Team Collaboration; CTEM Observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Increasing Writing Rigor: Writing for the 2013 FCAT rubric and beyond	Grades 9-12	Paul Holimon and other district literacy support staff	Reading/Literacy Coach, Language Arts Department Chair, 10th grade English teachers	October 16, 2012	Academic Coaching support; Data Team collaboration; CTEM observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Incorporate analytical writing as primary response to close reading of multiple texts	Grades 9-12	Principal, APC, academic coaches	School-wide	ER Days, Inservice Days, Data Team meetings	Academic Coaching support; Data Team collaboration; CTEM observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams

"Check for 3" for all writing in all content areas	Grades 9-12	Principal, Academic Coaches	School-wide	Pre Service Week	Academic Coach support; Data Team Collaboration; CTEM Observations	Administration Academic Coaches Data Teams
Data Team Training- operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grade 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School wide	Pre service week	Monitor 2x month	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
Intertextual Triad training across the curriculum	Grades 9-12	Diane Krapf	School wide	October-May teacher planning periods, Data team mtgs., ER Days	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and your classroom	Grades 9-12	Irene Benfatti and Erin O'Guinn	School wide	Sept. 26 ER Day	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
UNIQUE Curriculum Training	Grades 9-12	CCPS ESE Personnel	Self Contained Teachers	2012-2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies: Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	1a.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.	1a.Administration 2a.Academic Coaches 3a.Dept. Chairs 4a.Teachers	1a.Teachers will administer short and extended writing responses on a weekly basis in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used.	1a.Student writing samples 2a.CTEM iObservation
2	1b.Instructional Rigor: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard or benchmark.	1b.During classroom observations, administrators and academic coaches will assess that the learning goals are appropriate and specific to the standard along with accompanying scales to identify grauated levels of performance.	1b.Administration 2b.Academic Coaches 3b.Dept. Chairs 4b.Teachers	1b.Monitor instructional practice through CTEM process focusing on Domain one, Question one-Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback.	1b.CTEM reports 2b.CTEM iObservation protocols. 3b.Lesson Plans 4b.Common board configuration
3	1c. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction: Lessons/activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners	1c.Data teams will meet twice each month for the purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inoform and drive instruction in each classroom. 2c.Planning and instruction will reflect new NGSSS and CCSS to the newly adopted instructional materials.	1c.Administration 2c.Academic Coaches 3c.Dept. Chairs 4c.Data Team Teachers	1c.Data Team protocols 2c.Monitor instructional practice through CTEM process focusing on Domain one, Questions 2-4 Lesson Segments addressing Content	1c.CTEM reports 2c.CTEM iObservation protocols. 3c.Lesson Plans 4c.Common board configuration

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Social Studies Writing Cohort emphasis on Intertextual triads.	Grades10-11	Wendy Hodgson-Social Studies CCPS	World Hisotry and US History teachers	October-May 2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation US History BM testing	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team Wendy Hodgson-CCPS Social Studies
Data Team Training-operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School wide	Monitor 2x month	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
Webb's Depth of Knowledge and your classroom	Grades 9-12	Irene Benfatti and Erin O'Guinn	School wide	Sept. 26 Er Day	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation US History BM testing	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
Test Item Specification and how they relate to Power Standards, appropriate levels of Rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to utilize.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation US History BM testing	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
Marzano Training on High Yield Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation US History BM testing	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team

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:	By July 2013, the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) will increase from 95% to 96%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
22% (490)	17% (263)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
0% (0)	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. Students often	The office of A/D will	APD, Dean	Compare ADA from	Attendance

1	miss school due to family issues, such as legal/court proceedings (which can take them to their home countries for extended periods of time), babysitting younger siblings, and transportation issues.	adhere to the CCPS Attendance policy 5200 to maintain continuous parental communication. Phone calls will be made whenever students miss 5 days of school, and attendance letters will be mailed home at 7 and 10 days warning of the consequences of high absenteeism. A daily phone dialer will also be utilized to report daily absences home to parents. Each of these communication devices will emphasize the new attendance policy which reinforces high ADA.		year-to-year to ensure ADA increases.	reports
2	1.2. Students are occasionally tardy to classes, and the attendance policy dictates that tardies of 10 or more minutes to a class will equate to an absence.	The office of A/D will utilize a tardy policy, which operates on a progression of discipline. Students will be issued consequences based on their frequency of tardies. Various interventions will be used, some of which include attendance contracts, parent phone calls/letters, parent conferences, CAST meetings.	APD, Dean	Compare ADA from year-to-year to ensure ADA increases.	Attendance reports
3	1.3. Students sometimes make poor choices, which lead to suspensions, and thus they miss school.	1.3. The office of A/D will utilize other interventions than suspensions, when appropriate. Lunch detentions, after school detentions, and Saturday school will be utilized as often as possible. PBS rewards will also be issued for those who make positive choices, and are thus in school more regularly.	APD, Dean	Compare ADA from year-to-year to ensure ADA increases.	Attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC - Attendance / credit denial	10-11	Rachel Dawes	APD Academic Coaches Guidance Counselor	Sept. 7, 2012	Quarterly/Semester	Rachel Dawes
			APD			

PLC - Attendance / credit denial	12	Rachel Dawes	Academic Coaches Guidance Counselor	Aug. 31, 2012	Quarterly/Semester	Rachel Dawes
PLC - Attendance procedures/ policies/ interventions/ PBS	School-wide	Rachel Dawes	APD/Dean Academic Coaches Guidance Counselors Teachers	Sept. 17, 2012	Semester	Rachel Dawes

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:	By July 2013, the number of in-school suspensions, total in-school suspension days assigned, percent of students receiving in-school suspension days, and the number of students receiving Out-of-School suspension will be decreased by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
532	506
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
18% (250)	13% (238)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

459	436
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
15% (219)	10% (208)

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 sometimes make poor choices, which lead to suspensions.	1.1. The office of A/D will utilize other interventions than suspensions, when appropriate. Lunch detentions, after school detentions, and Saturday school will be utilized as often as possible.	APD/Dean	1.1. Compare suspension reports from year-to-year to ensure suspension rates decrease.	Suspension reports
2	1.2. Teachers will occasionally write referrals for issues that could have been handled within the classroom.	1.2 The office of A/D, along with the Intervention Specialist and other academic coaches, will assist teachers with classroom management strategies, PBS training, peer classroom observations, and PLCs to discuss issues that can be addressed within the classroom.	APD	1.2 Compare suspension reports from year-to-year to ensure suspension rates decrease.	Suspension reports
3	1.3. Various students have anger-management issues, mental health issues, and/or are students with disabilities, and those issues can impact the educational/learning environment.	1.3. The office of A/D, along with the Intervention Specialist and other academic coaches and Guidance counselors, will reinforce the reward system, implement school-wide expectations (teach and re-teach), utilize the LEAPS curriculum, collaborate with the ESE office to implement Positive Behavior Intervention Plans, and encourage parental involvement.	APD	1.3 Compare suspension reports from year-to-year to ensure suspension rates decrease.	Suspension reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

PLC - PBS/ interventions/ infractions vs. referrals	New teachers	Rachel Dawes	APD New teachers	Sept. 5, 2012	Quarterly reports PBS meetings	Rachel Dawes
PLC - Discipline procedures / policies/ interventions/ PBS/ 7 habits	School-wide	Rachel Dawes	All staff	Aug. 17, 2012	Quarterly reports PBS meetings	Rachel Dawes
PLC - Discipline procedures/ policies/ interventions/ PBS	School-wide	Rachel Dawes	APD/Dean Academic Coaches Guidance Counselors Teachers	Sept. 17, 2012	Quarterly reports PBS meetings	Rachel Dawes
PLC - Discipline procedures/ policies/ interventions/ PBS	School-wide	Rachel Dawes	APD/Dean Academic Coaches Guidance Counselors Teachers	Sept. 26, 2012	Quarterly reports PBS meetings	Rachel Dawes

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.*	The percentage of students considered dropouts will decrease from 2.4(3)% to 1.9(2)% The percentage of students meeting the graduation requirements will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:

2.4(3)%	1.9(2)%
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
68.7(484)%	73.7%

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	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	-PD to continuously improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction -Problem identification and analysis -Monthly PLC/Data Team discussions -7 Habits of Highly Effective People, Leadership Program -Intervention Specialist & PBS -Data chats -iLead credit recovery lab - AVID & Cambridge AICE Programs - Destination Graduation Program - Peer Mentoring	Principal, AP, Dean, MTSSS, Specialist, Guidance Counselors, Academic Coaches, teachers	School will engage in problem analysis activities to identify instructional, curricular, and environmental barriers to graduation. Will also monitor and follow-up with students demonstrating at-risk behaviors and attendance issues.	-Data warehouse reports and information -Data Team/PLC indicators -Attendance & Discipline reports -Mini lesson assessments -Weekly assessments -Quarterly assessments -Assessment checklists -FCAT
2	Lack of motivation caused by various external and internal factors: -Poor attendance -Illicit activities -Behavioral issues -Pregnancy -Must work to help support the family -Bullying/Harassment Home and family issues	-Problem identification and analysis -Monthly PLC discussions -7 Habits of Highly Effective People, Leadership Program -Intervention Specialist & PBS -Data chats -Student led conferences	Principal, AP, Dean, MTSSS, Specialist, Guidance Counselors, Academic Coaches, teachers, parents	School will engage in problem analysis activities to identify instructional, curricular, and environmental barriers to graduation. Will also monitor and follow-up with students demonstrating at-risk behaviors and attendance issues.	Three reports are run concurrently to determine "red flags" to potential dropout: Attendance, Discipline, and Failure Report. The student is provided with information and support. The administration will track the students to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions.

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

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

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

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.*	Historically, only a small percentage of our parents have attended school activities. Our goal is to continue to find ways to encourage parental involvement and engagement in their child’s academic and extracurricular school life. Parent Involvement activities and events will be planned, designed, implemented, and evaluated throughout the school year in order to ensure increase in parent participation.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Less than 15% (180)	More than 60% (840)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	More than 60% (840)of the 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.	Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide translation in Spanish and Creole at all parent functions, meetings, and trainings. Utilize bilingual staff and students to assist parents in navigating around the school and for translations.	Parent Involvement Committee Dean Principal	Collect participation data Formal and informal parent surveys	Copies of all materials sent home. Results of various surveys.
2	More than 75% (1,050) of the students are from families of "Economically Needy". Parents desire to attend school functions and activities but have diffulty attending day-time events due to child care, transportation, and employment-related issues.	Serve food at evening events. Plan teacher/parent conferences to meet all stakeholders' needs. Provide child-care services at parent training events. Promote community involvement to provide transportation to school functions.	Parent Involvement Committee Dean Principal	Meeting and Event Agenda Minutes Formal and Informal Parent and Staff Surveys	Attendance Sign-in Sheets Minutes
3	More than 50% (700) of the students' parents and/or extended family members are immigrants They have expressed interest in expanding their knowledge of the federal, state, and the local school system procedures and policies.	Organize and conduct various parent training sessions. Present various training sessions for staff in regards to effective communication with immigrant families.	Parent Involvement Committee Dean Principal	Meeting and Event Agenda Formal and Informal Parent and Staff Surveys	Attendance Sign-in Sheets Results of various surveys

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	70% 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.	1.1 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.	Principal, APC, Academic Coaches	1.1 1a. Utilize content area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief and discuss observations and plan for next steps. 1b. Utilize agreed upon, research-based effective teaching strategies. 1c. Participate in a PLC Lesson Study to establish best practices for instruction and share effective teaching strategies. 1d. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	1.1 CTEM, Administrators' observations, PLC notes
	1.2. Students do not clearly understand the importance of taking	1.2 2a. Use resources such as email, Edmodo, assemblies, electronic	Principal, APC,Guidance Counselors, Teachers	1.2 2a. Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal	1.2 CTEM, Administrators' observations,

2	higher level math, science, AP and dual enrollment courses in regard to future career options.	flyers, etc. to promote STEM courses and careers. 2b. All Earth/Space Science teachers will utilize strategies in their classroom in order for students to participate in the Teach Me In My World Project which integrates technology with academic content. 2c. Monitor numbers and percentages of students in all STEM courses with a goal of increasing enrollment in these courses by 10%.		setting and reviewing individual student's data. 2b. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. 2c. Review and use various district data programs to monitor course enrollment numbers.	Data Warehouse reports, SILK, TERMS

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
STEM support across the Curriculum	Grades 9-12	Tara Bode and Kim Ragusa	School-wide	November & December 2012 during teacher planning	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Science and Math BM testing	Administration Academic Math & Science Coaches Data Team
Earth/Space Science teachers will receive on-going, iPad training and support in order to create student collaborative learning environments in class.	Grade 9	Martha Green, Curt Withoff and Tara Bode	Earth/Science teachers	2012-2013	CTEM iObservation	Administration Science Coach
Discovery Education support using High School Techbook in order to develop writing prompts using web 2.0 technology.	Grades 9-12	Tara Bode	Science Department	2012-2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols, CTEM iobservation	Administration Science Coach Data Team
STEM support for						

eduators who are presenting and/or participating in the CCPS 2013 STEM Conference.	Grades 9-12	Tara Bode and Kim Ragusa	School-wide	2012-2013	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Math & Science Coaches Data Teams

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.

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. Teachers are not industry certified.	1.1a Provide professional development and opportunities to complete industry certification testing for CTE and non CTE teachers. 1.1b Provide instructional tools and teacher if training for teachers to use in the classroom that will	Principal, APC	Monitoring of participation in PD activities and subject area exams.	Observation and data collection.

		promote student success on industry certifications.			
2	1.2. Career Themed Courses have not been identified for each school. Consideration at each school must be teacher certifications, course requests, and computer lab accessibility.	1.2a 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. 1.2b 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. 1.2c Increase the number of students in Career Themed Courses by training additional teachers in Content Area Reading teacher programs. 1.2d Increase the number of Career Themed Academies (both CTE and non-CTE courses). 1.2e Provide all 8th grade students at FCAT level 3 or above in reading the	Principal, APC, CTE Teachers	Monitoring of participation in PD activities and subject area exams. Monitor the number of students participating in CTE courses and successfully completing industry certifications.	Observation and data collection.

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
Marzano Training on High Yield Teaching Strategies utilizing Doug Reeves "Power of the Zero" lecture.	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
PBS in CTE	Grades 9-12	Scholastica Lee and Larry Capasso	CTE Teachers	Data Team Mtgs. 2x month	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team
Data Team						

Training-operational data team process including protocol writing and integration with ANGEl and Data Warehouse	Grades 9-12	Jose Hernandez and Dan Cox	School wide	Pre Service Week	monitor 2x month	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
Test Item Specification and how they relate to Power Standards, appropriate levels of Rigor (cognitive complexity), and what strategies are best to utilize.	Grades 9-12	Susan McNally	School wide	Pre Service Week	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation	Administration Academic Coaches Data Team
Intertextual Triad training across the curriculum	Grades 9-12	Diane Krapf	School wide	October-May teacher planning periods, Data team mtgs., ER Day	Data Team monitoring of meetings and protocols CTEM iObservation Monitor PM Writing scores	Administration Academic Reading Coach Data Team

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)

Community Partnerships Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Community Partnerships Goal Community Partnerships Goal #1:	To nurture and engage an active community of families, organizations and volunteers who will work with the district to help all students succeed. Increase the number of community partners by 10%. • Objective 3: Ensure that all schools have the needed level of community support to help all students succeed • Objective 4: Create partnerships that will work toward overcoming cultural, language and other barriers in this diverse community
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
68 Community Partnerships	75

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The economy has negatively impacted many Community and Business partners	Reach out to new partners and limit the amount of the request (time, financial support, other resources)	Principal & Activities Coordinator	Monitoring and documenting the type and level of support	Documentation tool available on Data Warehouse to capture support

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Community Partnerships Goal(s)

Family/Parent Involvement Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Family/Parent Involvement Goal Family/Parent Involvement Goal #1:	To collaborate with families as full partners in the learning and development of their children. • Objective 1: Build a positive school connection with families and parents that overcomes cultural and language barriers • Objective 2: Involve families and parents in student learning • Objective 3: Create options for alternate uses of time that increases student achievement and development and family involvement
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
TBD	TBD

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	Families from low SES and limited English proficiency often find it difficult to get involved in school activities	Provide translating services, free child-care, and refreshments	Principal & Title 1 contact	Monitoring and documenting attendance and participation	Documentation tools to capture attendance and participation

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Family / Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Quality Learning Experiences Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Quality Learning Experiences Goal Quality Learning Experiences Goal #1:	To provide a safe, caring, rigorous learning environment, for a diverse student body, that offers multiple opportunities for success and supports student achievement and development. • Objective 1: Create and maintain a safe, caring learning environment with minimal disruptions where all students have a sense of belonging, and are respected and accepted by teachers, peers and the community • Objective 2: Create and maintain a teacher guided instructional program focused on advancement through the levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy and the interactive engagement of students with teachers, peers and resources • Objective 3: Ensure all students are immersed in data-driven, evidence-based curricular programs that provide diverse learning experiences and multiple opportunities to master the Florida educational standards
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
TBA	TBA

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	Barriers include time, effective implementation of strategies with fidelity, student and staff motivation	- Continue the implementation of PBS and 7 Habits - Effective, focused PD targetting high-yield instructional strategies and best practice - Use of Data Teams to plan, implement, and monitor instruction	Administrators, Academic Coaches, Instructional Staff	Frequent monitoring, reporting, and documenting of data. Revising as needed.	PLC conversations, TERMS reports, 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
No Data Submitted						

Budget:

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

ELL Student Performance Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. ELL Student Performance Goal ELL Student Performance Goal #1:	Goal (1) By the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, 74% of ELL students at Golden Gate High School will have made progress towards acquiring English language in listening/speaking, 58% in Writing and 60% in Reading as measured by spring CELLA test results. Goal 2: By the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, 11% in grades 9-12 will have increased in attaining English-language proficiency as measured by spring CELLA test results.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
TBD	TBD

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. Lack of previous education or limited education.	1.1. Provide intensive English through listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. 1.2. Provide intensive vocabulary development strategies. 1.3. Incorporate the use of graphic organizers. 1.4. Ask and answer questions to understand what they read, hear, interpret ideas, and think more deeply about their learning. 1.5. Brainstorm – Teachers will present the opportunity for students to brainstorm about ideas for a story and ways to solve problems.	1.1. ELL Coach 1.2. Coordinator of ELL Administration	1.1.Classroom Walk Throughs 1.2. Mentor observations.	1.1. Rubrics 1.2. Pre and Post assessments
2	1.2. Lack of academic skills in ELLs' heritage language.	1.2. Incorporate shared reading strategies in daily mini-lessons. 1.3 Elicit background knowledge through a KWL Chart, sequence, note-taking. 1.3 Teachers will utilize Concept- mapping as part of the mini-lessons to elicit language through story telling.	1.2. ELL Coach ELL Coach 1.3 Coordinator of ELL Administration	1.2. Classroom Walk Throughs 1.3. Mentor observations.	1.2. Rubrics 1.3. Pre and post assessments

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of ELL Student Performance Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	After School Tutoring & Homework Help	Language Arts/Reading teacher will be provided for the after school program	SAC School Improvement Funds	$3,000.00
CELLA	.5 - ELL SIOP Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide SIOP program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use SIOP-based ELL learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to SIOP strategies as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups, such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$43,282.00
Mathematics	After School Tutoring & Homework Help	Mathematics teacher will be provided for the after school program	SAC School Improvement Funds	$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $49,282.00

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
Mathematics	1.0 - Math Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide numeracy program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use mathematics-based learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' math literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to math strategies as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups,	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$60,576.00

		such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.		
Science	1.0 - Science Coach	Responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive schoolwide literacy program which facilitates learning; for modeling of best practices lessons which use literacy-based learning strategies; for coaching teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' literacy skills; for identifying staff development needs of the school and for providing staff development related to literacy as part of the problem solving process; and for working with school and community groups, such as the Leadership Team, Lead Literacy Team and learning communities, to help all students reach their highest potential.	Title 1 Basic Use of Funds	$46,870.00
				Subtotal: $107,446.00
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: $156,728.00

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 will be used to pay for our After School Tutoring/Homework Help Program.	$6,000.00

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

The Golden Gate High School Advisory Council (SAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision making relating to the implementation of school improvement. Meetings are scheduled for the third or fourth Monday of each month beginning in September. Members are elected by their peer groups (parents, instructional staff, non-instructional staff) at the September or October meeting each school year. In the event that elections do not provide for adequate representation of all demographic groups, community members are sought to achieve the appropriate balance. The community members are brought to the SAC for approval. Following the election, the SAC membership information is forwarded to the District School Improvement Office and presented to the District School Board of Collier County for approval. Also at the October meeting, elections are held for SAC Chairperson and secretary. SAC members are expected to regularly attend SAC meetings. SAC reviews SIP objectives, analyzes data, assists in preparation of the school improvement plan and assists with the establishment of the school's locational budget as well as the budget for school improvement funds. Through monthly meetings the SAC plays an integral role in the school improvement process. Additional activities include discussions and decisions on matters such as Title 1, A+ Recognition funds, and the use of allocated SAC funds.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Collier School District
GOLDEN GATE HIGH SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	40%	68%	80%	30%	218	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	48%	74%			122	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?	48% (NO)	78% (YES)			126	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					466	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Collier School District
GOLDEN GATE HIGH SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	37%	62%	86%	25%	210	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	42%	66%			108	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?	35% (NO)	57% (YES)			92	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					410	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested