FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SCHWETTMAN EDUCATION CENTER

District Name: Pasco

Principal: Randall Koenigsfeld

SAC Chair: Roxana Sanchez

Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino

Date of School Board Approval: November 1, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/6/2012

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	Randall Koenigsfeld	B.A. Math Education,Masters Educational Leadership	8	21	HSEC 2012: Declining HSEC 2011: Declining/AYP No HSEC 2010: Declining/AYP No RHS 2009: D/AYP No RHS 2008: D/AYP No RHS 2007: C/AYP No

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)
Literacy Coach	TBA				

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	District guidelines will be followed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers	Administration	Annual	

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
Available October 2012	

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
14	7.1%(1)	21.4%(3)	50.0%(7)	28.6%(4)	28.6%(4)	100.0%(14)	28.6%(4)	0.0%(0)	92.9%(13)

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
Sue Grassin	Henry Manzo	Middle School Team	Classroom management, curriculum development, lesson plan development

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

District utilizes Part D funds to support our academic instruction, credit recovery programs, and parent involvement efforts.

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- School Administrator
- General and Special Education Teachers
- Literacy Coach
- School Nurse
- School Psychologist
- School Social Worker
- Behavior Specialist
- Guidance Counselor
- Technology Specialist
- SRO
- Instructional Assistant for Discipline

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?

• Leadership team uses PS/RtI to drive all functions of the school and to connect all teams collaboratively
• S-BIT: Students are identified by the school-level teams; committee meets weekly
• Review of Universal Screening data and other pertinent information on students
• Use the problem solving process for problem identification and problem analysis
• Planning for Interventions
• Assessment of RTI implementation progress and integrity of interventions
• Review of Progress Monitoring data.
• Assessment of school staff's practices and skill development
• Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RTI implementation.

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

• Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation.
• Identification of critical RTI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity.
• Analysis of school-wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends.
• Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention.
• Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment).
• Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars.
• Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity

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.

Review of Progress Monitoring data.
• Planning for Interventions.
• Assessment of RtI implementation progress
• Assessment of school staff's skill development (RtI Skills Survey).
• Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation.
• FAIR, FCAT, EOC exams, point card, Core K-12, and TERMS

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

HSEC will participate in professional development training that will focus on the following:
• Description of data collection processes to assess current staff skills.
• Identification of days available for RtI professional development.
• Content of professional development days based on state model
• Individual professional development plan
• Resources to conduct professional development
• Resources to provide technical assistance and follow-up/support
• Plan for data collection to evaluate RtI implementation levels
• Ensure plan includes action steps for the development of absent or partially present RtI infrastructure components
• School based training (including S-BIT)

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

School Administrator
Literacy Coach
H.S. Team member
M.S. Team member
Vocational Team member
Guidanace Counselor
Technology Specialist
Reading Teacher

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

Meets regularly to perform the following functions:

Review data from assessments
Identify school wide literacy needs
Research/Recommend best practice teaching activities

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

Improve Reading Comprehension and writing skills

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Weekly study groups will review school wide Reading plan. Research based strategies will be demonstrated regularly.

*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?

Weekly high school team meetings discuss integrated curriculum. Team collaborates to implement cross-curriculum projects.

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

Guidance presentations

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

Student placement in college readiness courses. PERT assessment at year end for all juniors and seniors.

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:	By June, 2013, the students at reading proficiency will increase by 10% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (20) of our students scored at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June 2013, 17% of HSEC students will be proficient in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	It is challenging to implement differentiated instructional strategies in a classroom with varying levels.	professional development in the area of differentiated instruction; increased use of LFS in the classroom	All instructional staff and literacy coach	Walk-Throughs	Teacher Evaluations, lesson plans, formative and summative assessment results
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement	

Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June, 2013 students scoring Level 4 or Level 5 in reading will increase by 33% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3% (4) of our students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013 students scoring Level 4 or Level 5 in reading will increase to 4%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Curriculum and scheduling: Advanced courses not available; limited time and follow-up with students for reteaching or to provide remediation for specific areas of reading	Use differentiated teaching strategies with high level readers; implement consistent school wide reading strategies with all students	All instructional staff	Data analysis from assessments	FAIR reading, STAR reading

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June, 2013 students making learning gains in reading will increase by 10% as measured by FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (40) of our students made learning gains in reading. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June 2013, 39% of HSEC students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students transition in and out of Schwettman weekly, including up to the FCAT testing period	Ongoing assessments upon entry to HSEC; follow curriculum maps in the areas of English and reading	Reading and English teachers; Literacy coach	Data analysis from assessments	FAIR Reading, STAR Redaing
2	Poor rates of attendance	Attendance committee should develop attendance school wide attendance goals and interventions	Administration, Support staff, and attendance committee	Ongoing committee meetings to analyze data	Attendance data base
3	Students lack comprehension skills	Implementation of LFS learning strategies; providing direct, explicit comprehension instruction, staff development in the area of comprehension	instructional staff; literacy coach	walk-through's; data analysis from assessments	teacher evaluation; FAIR Reading, FCAT results, STAR Reading

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June, 2013, the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 10% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (20) of the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading.Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in reading will increase to 18%.

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	Students lack comprehension skills	Implementation of LFS learning strategies; providing direct, explicit comprehension instruction, staff development in the area of comprehension	all instructional staff; literacy coach	walk-though's; data analysis from assessments	teacher evaluations; FAIR reading, STAR Reading
2	engagement: students lack the motivation to read and practice reading sills	use technology to provoke interest; staff development in motivational strategies	all instructional staff; literacy coach	student survey; data analysis from assessments	survey results; FAIR Reading, STAR Reading

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 : By June of 2017, 55% of HSEC will score at Acheivement Level 3 or above.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	18.34%	25.67%	33%	40.34%	47.67%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June, 2013 white students will increase by 10% in reading proficiency as measured by the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (7) of our white students scored proficient in reading. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, 10% of white students will achieve reading proficiency as measured by the FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack comprehension skills	Implementation of LFS learning strategies; providing direct, explicit comprehension instruction, staff development in the area of comprehension	all instructional staff; literacy coach	walk-through's; data analysis from assessments	teacher evaluations; FAIR reading, STAR Reading

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:	No ELL Subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup

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:	No SWD Subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup

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:	By June, 2013 economically disadvantaged students will increase by 10% in reading proficiency as measured by the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%(20) of our economically disadvantaged students were proficient in reading. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, 19% of our economically disadvantaged students will achieve reading proficiency as measured by the FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students transition in and out of Schwettman weekly, including up to the FCAT testing period	Ongoing assessments upon entry to HSEC; follow curriculum maps in the areas of English and reading	Reading and English teachers; Literacy coach	Data analysis from assessments	FAIR Reading, STAR Reading lesson plans
2	Engagement: students lack the motivation to read and practice reading sills	Use of technology to provoke interest; staff development in motivational strategies	All instructional staff; literacy coach	Student survey; data analysis from assessments	Survey results; FAIR Reading, STAR 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
Reading/Literacy Teaching Strategies	All Grade Levels and subjects	Literacy coach	All staff members	Sept-may (weekly meetings)	Walk through's and conferencing	Administration and literacy coach
LFS Unlocking the secrets	All instructional staff	district	All instructional staff	2012-13 school year	classroom observations	principal
Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	6-12	Literacy coach, principal	all instructional staff	throughout the year beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs;	Principal,literacy coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I, Part D Funds	$3,750.00
			Subtotal: $3,750.00
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
Reward system for improved reading performance	reward incentives	internal funding	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
			Grand Total: $4,250.00

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:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By June, 2013, middle school students scoring at Level 3 will increase by 10% in math proficiency as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (8) of our middle school students scored at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, at least 11% of the HSEC middle school students will score Level 3 in math.

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	It is challenging to implement differentiated instructional strategies in a classroom with varying levels.	professional development in the area of differentiated instruction; professional development on math content and student expectations on scope and sequence; increased use of LFS in the classroom;	All instructional staff	Walk-Through's	Teacher evaluations, lesson plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June, 2013, students scoring at Level 4 or 5 will increase by 10% in math proficiency as measured by the FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1% (1) of our middle school students at HSEC scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, students scoring at Level 4 or 5 will increase by 2% in math proficiency as measured by the FCAT.

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	Curriculum and scheduling: Advanced courses not available; limited time and follow-up with students for reteaching or to provide remediation (especially to 8R students) for specific areas of math;	Use differentiated teaching strategies with high level thinkers; implement consistent school wide math strategies with all students;	All instructional staff	Data analysis from assessments	Core K-12, STAR Math

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June, 2013, students making learning gains in math will increase by 10% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (20) of HSEC middle school students made learning gains in mathematics. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, 36% of HSEC students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students transition in and out of Schwettman weekly, including up to the FCAT testing period	Ongoing assessments upon entry to HSEC; follow curriculum maps in the areas of Math	Math teachers	Data analysis from assessments	Core K-12. STAR math
2	Poor rates of attendance	Attendance committee should develop attendance school wide attendance goals and interventions	Administration, Support staff, and attendance committee	Ongoing committee meetings to analyze data	Attendance data base
3	Students have higher level thinking deficits in the area of math	using extending strategies in math; implement the instruction of higher order thinking skills; incorporate math across all curriculum	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	Core K-12; STAR math, EOC exams in math

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June, 2013, the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in math will increase by 10% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (3) of the lowest quartile of students made learning gains in math. Data Source: Pasco STAR	By June, 2013, the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in math will increase to 18% as measured by the FCAT.

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	It is challenging to implement differentiated instructional strategies in a classroom with varying levels.	professional development in the area of differentiated instruction; professional development on math content and student expectations on scope and sequence; increased use of LFS in the classroom;	All instructional staff	Walk-Through's	teacher Evaluations
2	Students have higher level thinking deficits in the area of math	using extending strategies in math; implement the instruction of higher order thinking skills; incorporate math across all curriculum	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	Core K-12; EOC exams in math
3	Student test 2 or more grade levels behind	Students who are identified as being significantly behind are placed in the intensive math class	Administration	ongoing assessments	Core K-12, STAR math, FCAT math

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%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # 5A : By June of 2017, 55% of HSEC middle school students score at Achievement Level 3 or above					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	10%	19%	28%	37%	46%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	No ELL Subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup	No ELL Subgroup

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	No SWD Subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Subgroup	No SWD Sudgroup

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June, 2013, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra will increase by at least 10% as measured by the end of course Algebra examination.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (2) of HSEC students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Data Source:Pearson Assessment Reports	By June, 2013 10% of students taking the Algebra end of course exam will score at the achievement level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	It is challenging to implement differentiated instructional strategies in a classroom with varying levels.	professional development in the area of differentiated instruction; professional development on math content and student expectations on scope and sequence; increased use of LFS in the classroom;	All instructional staff	Walk-Through's	Teacher evaluations, lesson plans
2	Students have higher level thinking deficits in the area of math	using extending strategies in math; implement the instruction of higher order thinking skills; incorporate math across all curriculum	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	Core K-12; STAR math, EOC exams in math

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:	By June, 2013, students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra will increase by at least 25% as measured by the end of course Algebra examination.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

4% (1) of HSEC students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra. Data Source:Pearson Assessment Reports	By June, 2013 5% of HSEC students taking the Algebra end of course exam will score at the achievement level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Curriculum and scheduling: Advanced courses not available; limited time and follow-up with students for reteaching or to provide remediation (especially to 8R students) for specific areas of math;	Use differentiated teaching strategies with high level readers; implement consistent school wide reading strategies with all students; pull-IN math class	All instructional staff	Data analysis from assessments	Core K-12, STAR Math

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 : By June of 2017, 3% of HSEC will score at Acheivement Level 3 or above.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	19	25.6	32.4	39.3	46.1	

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	N/C

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/C	N/C

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	N/C
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/C	N/C

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By June, 2013, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry will increase by at least 20% as measured by the end of course Geometry examination.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1) of HSEC students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Data Source:Pearson Assessment Report	By June, 2013 6% of students taking the Geometry end of course exam will score at the achievement level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	It is challenging to implement differentiated instructional strategies in a classroom with varying levels.	professional development in the area of differentiated instruction; professional development on math content and student expectations on scope and sequence; increased use of LFS in the classroom;	All instructional staff	Walk-Through's	Teacher evaluations, lesson plans
2	Students have higher level thinking deficits in the area of math	using extending strategies in math; implement the instruction of higher order thinking skills; incorporate math across all curriculum	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	Core K-12; STAR math, EOC exams in math

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:	By June, 2013, several students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 in Geometry as measured by the end of course Geometry examination.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No student scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Geometry. Data Source	By June, 2013, several students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in Geometry as measured by the end of course Geometry examination.

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
	Curriculum and scheduling: Advanced	Use differentiated teaching strategies	All instructional staff	Data analysis from assessments	Core K-12, STAR Math

1	courses not available; limited time and follow-up with students for reteaching or to provide remediation areas of math;	with high level readers; implement consistent school wide reading strategies with all students; pull-IN math class			

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 : By June of 2017, 55% of HSEC will score at Acheivement Level 3 or above.

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	15	25	35	45	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
LFS Unlocking the secrets	All instructional staff	District	All instructional staff	2012-13 school year	classroom observations	principal
math Teaching Strategies	All Grade Levels and subjects	principal	All staff members	Sept-may (weekly meetings)	Walk through's and conferencing	
Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	6-12	principal	all instructional staff	throughout the year beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs;	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00
			Subtotal: $3,750.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,750.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science 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 science. Science Goal #1a:	By June, 2013 students scoring level 3 in science will increase by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2% (1) of students at HSEC scored level 3 in science. Data Source: Pearson Reports	By June, 2013 3% of HSEC students will score level 3 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the motivation to acquire a science knowledge base	utilize more hands-on techniques in the classroom	science teachers	data analysis from assessments	Formal assessments, Core K-12, lesson plans

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June, 2013 students scoring level 4 in science will increase by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2% (1) of students at HSEC scored level 4 in science. Data Source: Pearson Reports	By June, 2013 3% of HSEC students will score level 4 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	curriculum and scheduling: advanced courses not available	use differentiated teaching strategies with high level thinkers; implement consistent school wide strategies with all students	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	core k-12

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 science. Science Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	By June, 2013, 10% of HSEC students will score Achievement Level 3 in Biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27 students completed the Biology end of course exam. No students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Data Source: Pearson Assessment Reports	By June, 2013, 10% of HSEC students will score Achievement Level 3 in Biology.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the motivation to acquire a science knowledge base	utilize more hands-on techniques in the classroom	science teachers	data analysis from assessments	Formal assessments, Core K-12, lesson plans

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	By June, 2013 5% of HSEC students will score Acheivement Level 4 in Biology.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27 students completed the Biology end of course exam. No students scored at Achievement Level 4 in Biology. Data Source: Pearson Assessment Reports	By June, 2013 5% of HSEC students will score Acheivement Level 4 in Biology.

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	curriculum and scheduling: advanced courses not available	use differentiated teaching strategies with high level thinkers; implement consistent school wide strategies with all students	all instructional staff	data analysis from assessments	Core K-12

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
LFS Unlocking the secrets	All instructional staff	District	All instructional staff	2012-13 school year	classroom observations	principal
Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	6-12	principal	all instructional staff	throughout the year beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs	principal
Teaching Strategies for science	All Grade Levels and subjects	principal	All staff members	Sept-may (weekly meetings)	Walk through's and conferencing	principal

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
Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00
			Subtotal: $3,750.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,750.00

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:	By June, 2013, 50% or more of HSEC students will score Level 3.0 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (23) of the students of HSEC scored Level 3.0 or higher. Data Source: Pearson Reports	By June 2013, 50% or more student will score Level 3 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the motivation to write	brainstorm with students to draw an interest in writing; give students a choice in topics to write about; use free writing activities; use of open ended questions to provoke discussion and writing	all instructional staff	school-wide writing prompt	writing prompt rubric
2	Students lack basic writing skills	use differentiated instruction strategies; professional development in the essentials of writing (6 traits); encourage writing and the use of complete sentences across all curriculum	all instructional staff	school wide writing prompt; analyze data from writing assessments; FCAT	writing prompt rubric; results from FCAT Writes
3	Poor rates of attendance	Attendance committee should develop attendance school wide attendance goals and interventions; daily journal to keep students from falling behind	Administration, Support staff, and attendance committee	Ongoing committee meetings to analyze data	Attendance data base

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
6 Essential Traits of Writing training	all instructional staff	district	all instructional staff	2012-2013 school year	team meetings to collaborate	principal
Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	6-12	principal	all instructional staff	throughout the year beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs;	Principal
Teaching Strategies for writing	All Grade Levels and subjects	Literacy coach, principal	All staff members	Sept-may (weekly meetings)	Walk through's and conferencing	Administration and literacy coach
LFS Unlocking the secrets	All instructional staff	District	All instructional staff	2012-13 school year	classroom observations	principal

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
Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00

to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies			
			Subtotal: $3,750.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,750.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics 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 Civics. Civics Goal #1:	50% of our Civics students will score Level 3 on the Civics EOC in May of 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	50% of our Civics students will score Level 3 on the Civics EOC in May of 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students transition in and out of Schwettman weekly, including up to the EOC exam	Follow curriculum maps in the area of Civics Frequent comprehension checks	Civics Instructor	Data analysis from assessments	EOC

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 Civics. Civics Goal #2:	10% of students taking the Civics EOC will score at or above Achievement Level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	10% of students taking the Civics EOC will score at or above Achievement Level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Advanced courses not available	Use differentiated teaching strategies	Civics Instructor	Data Analysis from assessments	EOC

1	Limited number of advanced students				

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
Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	7 grade	Principal	Civics Teachers	throughout the year beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs	Principal

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Civics Textbooks	Civics Textbooks	District Funding	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: $2,500.00

End of Civics 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.	50% of students taking the EOC in U.S. History will score

U.S. History Goal #1:	at Achievement Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	50% of students taking the EOC in U.S. History will score at Achievement Level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students transition in and out of Schwettman weekly, including up to the EOC exam	Frequent comprehension checks Follow curriculum maps in the area of US History	History teacher	Data analysis from assessments	EOC

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:	10% of students taking the U.S. History EOC will score at or above Achievement Level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	10% of students taking the U.S. History EOC will score at or above Achievement Level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Advanced courses not available Limited number of advanced students	Use differentiated teaching strategies	History Instructor	Data Analysis from assessments	EOC

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
				Throughout the year		

Teacher collaboration in content group using the 4 questions as a guide	9-12	Principal	History Intructors	beginning with the training offered August 6th - 10th, meeting quarterly to plan, meeting weekly to review data and use this information to drive instruction, and ending at the end of the year	weekly content meetings, lesson plans, walk-throughs	Principal

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
US History Textbooks	Textbooks	District Funding	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: $2,500.00

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 June, 2013 the attendance rate at HSEC will increase by 6%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
71% Attendance Rate Data Source: TERMS	75% Attendance rate
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
57% (166) of students had excessive absences Data Source: TERMS	50% or fewer of student population with 10 or more absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students previous negative experiences with school (e.g., failure, aversive encounters with adults, etc);	Follow a behavioral modification system and utilize rewards and incentives, including activity days to make school positively reinforcing for students	All staff	Data from point card and number of students receiving rewards, discussion at S-BIT	Level system and Point card
2	Familial background does not value school as a priority	Orientation, parent calls home, PTC, open house, specific rewards for students based on attendance to emphasize the value to coming to school	All staff	Attendance data review	TERMS attendance data and Parent Survey

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
knowledge about interventions, rewards/reinforcers used in PBIS for attendance issues	all	support staff	school-wide	quarterly	follow-up meetings	administration

Attendance Budget:

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

Rewards system for students who attend	rewards/incentives	internal funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

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 June, 2013, the number of out of school suspensions will decrease by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
210 incidents occurred that resulted in ISS. Data Source: TERMS	189 incidents for the 2012 - 2013.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
85 students were suspended In School Data Source: TERMS	Less than 75 students will be suspended in school for the 2012 - 2013 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
223 incidents occurred that resulted in OSS. Data Source: TERMS	Less than 200 incidents may occur that will result in OSS during the 2012 - 2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
80 students were suspended Out of School. Data Source: TERMS	Less than 70 students will be suspended out of school during the 2012 - 2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student self control	Utilize our alternative to out of school suspension program; one to one and group counseling; use of incentives to following rules	All staff	Monitor discipline, attendance, and grades; student's self monitoring data,use of SBIT and RTI data	TERMS and points cards
2	Unclear behavioral expectations for students leading to inconsistencies in behavior and staff inconsistencies in what they expect from students	development of new/improved data-based level system (PBIS) with more specific, measurable skill areas; development of social matrix to specifically explain the skill areas; development of matrix for rating skill performance;	All staff and Principal	number of students on each level	TERMS and point card data

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
School-wide PBIS (point card/level system)	all	principal, discipline committee chair	all instructional staff, IA's	prior to commencement of school and quarterly	quarterly discipline committee meetings; weekly grade level meetings; support staff meetings re: discipline and point card	principal

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.*	75% of the the 8th grade recovery students will successfully transition to high school at the end of the school year.

2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
70% of the 8th grade recovery students transitioned to high school in June 2012	At least 75% of the 8th grade recovery students will successfully transition to high school at the end of the school year.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of motivation largely due to low academic levels and frustration	Continual communication of student progress with students, teachers, and parents; student self monitoring, especially for 8R and students using Nova Net; use of incentives; focus on remediation	All Instructional staff	Weekly 8R meetings to review data; S-BIT	Computerized 8R reports and transition data
2	Poor rates of attendance	Attendance committee should develop attendance school wide attendance goals and interventions	Administration, Support staff, and attendance committee	Ongoing committee meetings to analyze data	Attendance data base

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
Technology Training	8R	Technology Specialist	8R team	quarterly meetings	8R weekly team meetings	technology specialist and principal

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.*	Increase the number of families who attend open house by 40%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
35 families attended open house in October, 2012. Data Source: Sign In Form	50 families will attend open house in October, 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Work and/or transportation problems	Propose alternative meeting times for parents	Administration and support staff	Analyze data	Open house numbers
2	Lack of communication between home and school	Increase frequency in correspondence (calls, emails, PTC's) home whether for issues or positive reasons and for attendance concerns;	All instructional staff and support staff	Analyze data	Open house numbers
3	Parents do not feel comfortable at a school	communicate with parents for positive reasons; have activities at the school, such as the holiday dinner, to reach out and connect more positively with parents	support staff	parent attendance data	numbers for holiday dinner

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
training on how to involve parents more positiely	all	support staff	all instructional staff	once a year	parent contact logs	support staff, principal

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
Holiday Dinner	food	Trinity ROtary	$1,200.00
Parent Involvement Assistant (.2)	District staff member hired to increase parent involvement	Title I, Part D	$5,860.00
			Subtotal: $7,060.00
			Grand Total: $7,060.00

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:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I, Part D Funds	$3,750.00
Civics	Civics Textbooks	Civics Textbooks	District Funding	$2,500.00
U.S. History	US History Textbooks	Textbooks	District Funding	$2,500.00
				Subtotal: $8,750.00
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	using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00
Science	Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00
Writing	Teacher training on bridging the gap to increase performance through engagement - included using data to differentiate prior to lesson, diffusion and classroom management strategies, motivation strategies	District CIS grant funds	Title I Part D	$3,750.00
				Subtotal: $11,250.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reward system for improved reading performance	reward incentives	internal funding	$500.00
Attendance	Rewards system for students who attend	rewards/incentives	internal funds	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Holiday Dinner	food	Trinity ROtary	$1,200.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Involvement Assistant (.2)	District staff member hired to increase parent involvement	Title I, Part D	$5,860.00
				Subtotal: $8,560.00
				Grand Total: $28,560.00

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 (Uploaded on 9/5/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Student incentives	$2,000.00

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

The school advisory committee will be assisting at the development of the SIP and monitoring the progress of the plan. The SAC will also connect wit the community and secure business partnerships for HSEC.

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
No Data Found
No Data Found