

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: WILLIAM T. MCFATTER TECHNICAL CENTER

District Name: Broward

Principal: Jeanette Johnson

SAC Chair: Cara Pasquale

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/12

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Jeanette Johnson	Master's in Educational Leadership (M.Ed.), Florida Atlantic University, 1997 Bachelor of Arts, Major in English/Minor in Sociology, Wake Forest University, 1988 Certifications Educational Leadership; Local Director of Vocational Education; Marketing; and English	2	10	2012, Pending 2011, Pending, AYP - NO 2010, D, AYP - No 2009, D, AYP - No 2008, D, AYP - No 2007, C, AYP - No
		BS Marketing Education, MS Educational			

Assis Principal	Ellen Albano	Leadership; Certified – Local director of Vocational Education, Educational Leadership All Levels, Marketing Education Grades 6-12.	4	14	Increased high school enrollment at Sheridan Technical Center during the 2009-2010 school year; opened new EMT program as part of McFatter Technical Center. No FCAT or AYP at STC.
Assis Principal	Larry Rothman	BA Criminology Masters in Educational Leadership; Certified Educational Leadership, Local Director Vocational, Retailing	3	6	2011 – Pending, AYP – No 2010 – A, AYP - Yes 2009 – A, AYP - Yes 2008 - A, AYP – NA 2007 - A, AYP – NA
Assis Principal	Cara Daniel	BS – Business Education MA – Career/Tech Education; Certified- Educational Leadership Local Director Vocational Programs Business Ed 6-12	3	4	2011 – Pending, AYP - No 2010 - A, AYP - Yes 2009 – A, AYP - Yes 2008 – D, AYP-No 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)
Reading	Elise Vivenco	BA – Spanish MS - Reading	22	16	2012 - Pending 2011 - school grade A, AYP - Yes 2010 - school grade A, AYP - Yes 2009 – school grade A AYP - yes 2008- school grade A AYP – yes 2007 – school grade A AYP – Yes 2006 – school grade A AYP - Yes

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	NESS	Elise Vivenco	Ongoing	
2	PLC	Elise Vivenco & Sue Humeston	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0.03% (1)	Pursing classes at the local University Mentoring and support from a veteran AP Environmental Teacher

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
33	0.0%(0)	9.1%(3)	33.3%(11)	57.6%(19)	57.6%(19)	75.8%(25)	6.1%(2)	9.1%(3)	78.8%(26)

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
Elise Vivenco	James Scott	Experience/Background	NESS
Ashley Wood	TBD	Experience	NESS
Samantha Overfield	TBD	Experience	Ness

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

n/a

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

Workforce Funding will be used to increase training opportunities for Blackboard, Camista, Illumina

Career and Technical Education

– Carl Perkins Grant – Salaries for Post Secondary Instructors and student support services, Testing Coordinator/Transition Services Provider
Materials, supplies and equipment for Post-secondary and high school Career and Technical Programs and students

Job Training

Consultant services and travel expenses for students and staff such as SKILLS USA

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.

Hope Fox, ESE Specialist/RTI Team Coordinator
Alvin Ranzy, HS Guidance, Family Counselor
Cara Daniel, Assistant Director
Jeanette Schwartz, Psychologist
Mary Barone, Lead Counselor
Elise Vivenco, Reading Coach
Laura Holt, Social Worker
Counselors and teachers as needed

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Leadership Team reorganizes our resources to provide support to the teacher to increase student achievement. MTSS is a process which includes the provision of systematic, research-based instruction and interventions to struggling learners. Regular meetings are scheduled. MTSS intervention plans are designed, implemented, and monitored by the multi-disciplinary team of professionals. All interventions are data driven. The role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team is to meet on a regular basis to address teachers' concerns about struggling students and to help design intervention plans. The team utilizes the Comprehensive Problem Solving Process to assist teachers in meeting the needs of their students.

Principal: Facilitates the MTSS Team, conducts monthly meetings, monitors the implementation of all curriculum areas, approves necessary resources to achieve positive results, conducts data chats with teacher and students
Assistant Principal: Monitors behavior of students coordinates the school wide professional learning communities and conducts data chats with teachers and students.

ESE Specialist: Monitors the IEP services to students, monitors academic progress and resources for student, and coordinates ESE services.

School Psychologist: Evaluates students, consults with parents, reviews and suggests interventions and monitors results.

School Social Worker: Facilitates small groups for students dealing with emotional situation such as changing families, retention, grief; works with parents needing outside resources.

Reading Coach: Provides expertise on the reading process & interventions; coaches classroom teachers; monitors the implementation of the school-wide reading program.

Guidance Counselor: Facilitates classroom guidance, small group counseling, 504 plans, and assists families with outside resources.

Regularly scheduled meetings will be held to identify, evaluate, monitor and make relevant educational decisions for all students in need; both onsite and with sending schools.

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?

Members serve as collaborative team members for each objective and aid in the development of the strategies to be employed.

The MTSS/Support Team meets monthly to discuss the overall process of supporting students. Students may be identified based on teacher conversations, student data, behavior referrals, or parent concerns. Each member of the MTSS Leadership Team may function as case manager to work with teachers through the process of Tier II interventions, documenting the progress, and moving forward to an MTSS meeting. The focus of the MTSS Team is to develop a broad understanding of students in the school who are in need of support, what support/interventions are underway, and suggest additional resources.

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.

County forms for progress monitoring will be employed at 4/6 week intervals; in-house team/block meetings will be held to review data with team members.

McFatter uses a three tiered data driven system to ensure student success. The electronic Fusion database system allows all teachers, administrators, and support staff to monitor academic and behavioral status of the entire student body. The Fusion database contains student performance data related to FCAT Scores, ACT, SAT, BAT Scores, GPA and behavioral information.

Tier I is the "university level" which school wide and or class wide strategies are implemented to support behavioral or academic concerns. In Tier I, data are routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science and behavior. Data are used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. These same strategies are used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier II or Tier III interventions; all such students are referred to as the MTSS for consideration of how best to proceed. Tier II is the "targeted level" which small group or individualized strategies are implemented to support behavioral or academic concerns. Tier III is the "intense level" which highly individualized strategies is implemented to support behavioral and academic concerns. Additionally, in Tier II and III, the data sources include Intervention Records and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Pre-Planning week Training session August 13, 2012

Jeanette Johnson, Director and Cara Daniel, Asst. Director will provide an update on the MTSS process using PowerPoint Presentation, group discussion and group activity to review the different components of using the MTSS process to improve student achievement/behaviors in all content and technical areas. ESE Specialist and Asst. Director will provide an update on the MTSS process using PowerPoint Presentation, group discussion and group activity to review the different components of using the MTSS process to improve student achievement/behaviors in all content and technical areas.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The process to support MTSS at McFatter Technical Center will involve monthly meetings with all team members to review our processes and procedures to ensure we are meeting the needs of all of students. These meeting will be designed to review student performance data both academic and behavioral as well as review relevant educational research to support teachers, students and staff members with properly implementing and monitoring the MTSS process at McFatter Technical Center.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Elise Vivenco, Reading Coach; Cara Daniel, Administrator; Constance Hardy, Media; Chris Mimbs, English Teacher; and all interested English teachers; all other faculty members are welcomed to attend.

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

Meetings held once a month. Lead teachers, Reading Coach; open discussion re: topics on agenda developed to meet current needs to address the Common Core State Standards

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

Grade level literacy needs/project; summer reading lists; cross – curricular projects; technology integration in the curriculum.

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.

Professional Learning Communities address reading across the curriculum; weekly meetings for grade 9/10 teachers and other teachers as desired; address Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships, especially reading in subject areas and FCAT reading/writing skills. 11th & 12th grade teachers develop Professional Learning Community to focus on vertical teaming to enhance reading across the curriculum.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

All students are enrolled in Computing for College and Careers and Tech II during their freshmen and sophomore years prior to making decisions regarding which technical program to join. Students are prepared with technical competencies required for successful, emerging careers, while at the same time to be prepared for college admission and scholarship eligibility. The students are enrolled in a schedule of courses which combine the academic with the technical.

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

Students enroll in a predetermined set of academic and elective courses necessary for high school graduation, college admission and scholarship eligibility during their freshmen and sophomore years. During the junior and senior years, students pursue a schedule that continues those courses necessary for college admission, while adding a set of elective courses focused around a technical area of the student's choice. Such technical areas include: Medical Technology, Automotive Technology, Marine Science, Communication Arts, Practical Nursing, Culinary Arts and Architecture and Engineering.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

The High School Readiness Report revealed high numbers of students who successfully planned for their post-secondary role. This is a testament to the guidance staff; students are counseled into appropriate programs, post-secondary conferences are held with the BRACE advisor, guidance counselor, and individual student during their junior or senior year to discuss post-secondary goals and create plans to achieve them which leads to 97% of graduates pursuing post-secondary education, 2% joining the military, with 100% graduation rate total. Dual enrollment and AP courses are encouraged with more the 44.3% of our students passed at least one exam. The same strategies will continue, have continued, and have produced \$2.1 million dollars in scholarships to the 131 graduates of the class of 2012. AP classes have expanded; test scores are consistently above the state and national averages, CPT tests are now given to district recommended juniors and all eligible students participated in industry certification tests in their areas of concentration.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The number of high achieving students grows each year due to classroom instruction by highly trained instructors in all academic areas.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24.1%, 68 out of 282, of our students achieved proficiency FCAT 2.0 Level 3	27.6% (78)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. Student admittance based on grade 7 FCAT scores. Subject to change in grade 8. 1a.2. Lack of basic skills	1a.1. Students will have the opportunity to attend FCAT reading enhancement programs. 2. High yield strategies to be included in all classes. 1a.3. Student reading fluency and comprehension enforced through classroom performance and presentations	1a.1. Elise Vivenco 1a.2. High school teachers 1a.3. High school teachers	1a.1. Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate. 1a.2. Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate 1a.3. FCAT online scores, co-classroom teaching.	1a.1. Student Work, Report Card Grades, FCAT Reading Results 1a.2. Student Work, Report Cards Marzano Observation and Feedback for Administrators 1a.3. Student Work, Report Cards Marzano Observation and Feedback for Administrators

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:	The number of high achieving students grows each year due to classroom instruction by highly trained instructors in all academic areas.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (144) students achieved above proficiency (FCAT level 4 or 5) in Reading.	30% of our students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 5 and 5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Student admittance based on grade 7 FCAT scores. Subject to change in grade 8 2a.2. Lack of basic skills	2a.1 Students will have opportunity to attend FCAT reading enhancement programs. 2a.2. High yield strategies to be included in all classes	2a.1 Elise Vivenco 2a.2. High school teachers	2a.1. Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate 2a.2. Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate	2a.1-3 Student work, Report Card Grades, Results of FCAT Reading 2.0 and the BAT Assessments
2	Student admittance based on grade 7 FCAT scores. Subject to change in grade 8 Lack of basic skills	Students will have the opportunity to attend FCAT reading enhancement programs High yield strategies to be included in all classes	Elise Vivenco and High school teachers	Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate	Teacher reading practice guides

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:	Students demonstrated improved achievement in making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75.6%, 205.6 out of 272, of the students achieved learning gains in Reading	79%(215)

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 picked to attend via lottery. Basic skills often lacking	Interior progression of skills enhanced. Interior progression of skills Enhanced. Challenge students	High school teachers	Co classroom testing; review of all written, oral work. Comprehension tests; timed reading exercises; FCAT 2.0 on line review	Classroom tests, evaluation tools Reading guides

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:	
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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25%	
---	--

making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% has increased this year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82.9%, 31.5 out of 38, of our students made learning gains in Reading.	86.8% (33)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students picked to attend via lottery. Basic skills often lacking	DAR, San Diego, other tests administered upon entrance. Reinforce reading skills via tutoring, test retakes, etc.	Elise Vivenzo High school teachers	Comparison of test scores Evaluation in all activities	Tests; reading charts Teacher input guides
2	Lack of basic skills in reading	High Yield Strategies to be included	All High School Teachers	Reading and Language Arts teachers to review written and oral work; grade reviews, return as appropriate	Student Work, Report Card Grades, Results of FCAT Reading and the BAT 2 Assessments

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 # By June 2013, McFatter Technical High School 9th and 10th grade students who score non-proficient on the FCAT Reading 2.0 will be reduced by 2%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	87%	88%	90%	91%	92%	

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:	Population mirrors that of county, especially rise of Hispanic students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12.6%, 12 out of 95, white students not making satisfactory progress in Reading. 12.2%, 6 out of 49, black students not making satisfactory progress in Reading. 14.4%, 17 out of 118, Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in Reading. 12.5%, 2 out of 15, Asian students not making satisfactory progress in Reading. n/a for American Indian students.	White: .06% (6) Black: .06% (3) Hispanic: .08% (7) Asian: 0% American Indian: 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	5B.1 Students picked to attend via a lottery system	5B.1 DAR, San Diego, other tests administered upon entrance	5B.1 Elise Vivenco, Reading Coach	5B.1 Comparison of test scores	5B.1 Tests, reading charts
	5B.2 Lack of Basic skills in reading	5B.2. Reinforce reading skills, via tutoring, test retakes, etc	5B.2. High School teachers	5B.2. Evaluation in all activities	5B.2. Teacher Input

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:	All of our English Language Learners (ELL) students made progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Our student with Disabilities are making progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%, or 3 out of 6, Students with Disabilities are not making satisfactory progress in Reading.	85% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Increase in number of applicants	5D.1. Free Tutoring available before and after school, during lunch and Saturday Camps	5D.1. High School Teachers	5D.1. Evaluations included in all activities	5D.1. Teacher made tests, activities
	5D.2. Lack of Basic skills in reading	5D.2. Test taking strategies to be taught	5D.2. Elise Vivenco	5D.2. Student grades monitored and re-evaluated	5D.2. Growth Charts

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:	Our Economically Disadvantaged students are making progress in reading.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
19.20%, 23 of 120, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Reading.	10.8%(10)				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack of Basic skills in reading 5E.2. Continue Parent Seminars	5E.1. Test taking strategies to be taught 5E.2 Campaign to bring families to campus to provide an overview of resources available to assist students struggling in Reading	5E.1. Elise Vivenco 5E.2. Guidance Counselors, Reading Coach, Director, and Assistant Director	5E.1. Student grades monitored and re-evaluated 5E.2. Review survey results from the Parent Seminar and continuously monitor grades and participation in these events	5E.1. Growth Charts 5E.2. Parent participation and feedback from past surveys given to parents.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Common Standards in English & Language Arts	9th -12th	Elise Vivenco	School wide 9th - 12th Grades	Planning Days & Early Release	Feedback from PLC Meeting iObservation Data	Elise Vivenco, Reading Coach All Administrators

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Reading Camp and Core Area Tutoring	Provide before school, after school, during lunch and Saturday Tutoring	Magnet & School Accountability	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Secure funding in order to pay for SAT and ACT Testing for rising juniors that failed the FCAT 2.0 Reading tests	Students that are enrolled in reading classes are prepared and ready to take the SAT and/or ACT Test prior to the actual FCAT 2.0 Reading - Retakes	Magnet, School Accountability or School Budget	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		We have 2 students that are not proficient in listening/speaking			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
50% of our students are proficient					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students don't understand the significance of test for academic progression.	1.1. Guidance counseling	1.1. Lillie Henry	1.1. Monitoring of student visits to Guidance.	1.1. TERMS, Attendance

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:		We only have 2 students that are not proficient in listening/speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
50% of our students are proficient					
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	2.1. Students don't understand the significance of test for academic progression.	2.1. Instructional intervention using closing reading strategies.	2.1. All English teachers and Administrators	2.1. Marzano Observations	2.1. Report cards, tests, grades

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

We only have 2 students that are not proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students don't understand the significance of the test for academic progression	2.1. Instructional intervention using closing reading strategies.	2.1. All English Teachers	2.1. Marzano Observations	2.1. Report cards, tests

CELLA Budget:

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	The number of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra has increase yearly.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37.4%, or 37 out of 99, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.	47% (47)

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	New Text Books	Develop new Curriculum maps	Math Chair, Math Teachers, Assistant Director	Attendance, Marzano Observations	Weekly

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Algebra has increased yearly.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61.6%, or 61 out of 99, students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.	66% (66)

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
	Number of students	Evaluation skills from	Assistant Director,	Test results to evaluate	EOC Exam, in

1	entering high school with Algebra and Geometry	middle school thru EOC exams and in house placement test	Guidance Counselor, Teachers	skills base	house placement test
---	--	--	------------------------------	-------------	----------------------

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 # By June of 2013, McFatter Technical High School's student achievement gap in Algebra will be reduced by 1%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	95%	95%	96%	96%	97%	

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:		We anticipate that all of our student subgroups will make satisfactory progress in Algebra.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0%, or 0 out of 33, white students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. 6.7%, or 1 out of 15, black students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. 0%, or 0 out of 38, Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. 0%, or 0 out 9, Asian students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. n/a American Indian		White: 0% Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% American Indian: 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	3B.1. Lack of Basic Skills in Math	3B.1. Reinforce Math Skills through tutoring and test retakes, etc.	3B.1. Math Department	3B.1. Evaluation in all activities	3B.1. Teacher guides

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:		All of our English Language Learners (ELL) are making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	All of our students with Disabilities (SWD) are making satisfactory progress in Algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%, or 0 out of 5, Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Complacency	Math tutoring available before school and during lunch	Math Department	Evaluation included in all activities, student grades monitored and charted to provide growth	Teacher guides, textbooks, and teacher made tests

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:	Only one (1) Economically Disadvantaged student isn't making satisfactory progress in Algebra
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2.9%, or 1 out of 35, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of basic skills	Reinforce Math Skills through tutoring and tests retakes	Math Department	Evaluation in all activities	Teacher guides

End of Algebra EOC Goals

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:		Students will need additional assistance in Geometry to Achieve Level 3 on the EOC Exam Assessment.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
29.5%, or 33 out of 112, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.		38.3% (43)			
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	Math classes taken in middle school	Test taking strategies will be emphasized in Geometry classes	Math Department	Students grades to be monitored and evaluated for growth	Growth Charts and Performance of teacher made test
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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:		Students will need additional assistance in Geometry to Achieve Level 4 on the EOC Exam Assessment.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
66.1%, or 74 out of 112, students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.		70.5%(79)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student Complacency	Math tutorials available before school, after school and during lunch and reinforce math skills through a variety of strategies	Math Department	Evaluation included in all activities, student grades monitored and charted to provide growth	Teacher guides; textbook and teacher made tests

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 # By June 2013, McFatter Technical High School's student achieve gap in Geometry will be reduced by 1%.			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	95%	95%	96%	97%	

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:	Our student subgroups by ethnicity students are making satisfactory progress in Geometry
---	--

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

4.9%, or 2 out of 41, white students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. 12.5%, or 2 out of 16, black students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. 2%, or 1 out of 50, Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. 0%, or 0 out of 4, Asian students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. n/a American Indian	White: 0% Black: 0% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% American Indian: 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 basic skills in math	Free math tutoring available before and after school	Math Department	Evaluation included in all activities	Teacher made test and student progress reports

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	All of our English Language Learners (ELL) are making satisfactory progress in Geometry
---	---

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:	Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) are making satisfactory progress in Geometry
--	---

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

--	--

0%, or 0 out of 2, students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		0%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Number of students with disabilities could expand as magnet criteria has been met	Continue to provide support services	Hope Fox, ESE Specialist and Math teachers	All grades to be reviewed and monitored	Teacher made test

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:	We only have (3) Economically Disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6.7%, or 3 of 45, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase number of applicants on Economically Disadvantaged due to current economic conditions	Free math tutoring available before school and at lunch	Math Department	Evaluation included in all activities	Teacher made tests and activities

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
PLC Common Core State Standards	9th-12th	Mr. Jauch	9th-12th Grade teachers	Planning Days & Early Release Days	Marzano Observations Feedback from PLC implementation in the classroom	Ms. Daniel, Assistant Director Elise Vivenco, Inservice Facilitator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

EOC Geometry Tutoring and Other math Subjects	Geometry tutoring during throughout the school year in preparation for testing	Magnet School Accountability	\$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 Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:			The number of students scoring at Level 3 in Biology is increasing yearly.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
31.4%, or 43 of 137, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.			38%(53)		
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 basic understanding of new EOC Biology Exam	Reinforce Biology with tutoring and instructional interventions	George Mikus	Comparison of Pre and Post test	School made tests

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:			The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Biology is increasing yearly.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
63.5% or, 87 of 137, students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.			67%(92)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Student Complacency	Offer tutoring and enrichment opportunities for all students	Biology Teachers	Evaluation included in all activities	Teacher guides, results on teacher made test, EOC pre and post test results
---	---------------------	--	------------------	---------------------------------------	---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC on Common Core Standards English/Language Arts	9th – 12th	Andrew Jauch	School-wide PLC 9th – 12th grades	Planning Days & Early Release Days	Feedback from PLC Meetings Marzano Observations	Teachers All Administrators

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Science & EOC Exam Tutoring	Tutoring before, during lunch and after school	School Budget	\$1,500.00
EOC Biology Tutoring and other Core Science subjects	Intensive tutoring throughout the school in preparation for EOC Testing	Magnet & School Accountability	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,000.00

End of 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:	96% of the 143 students tested scored 4 – 6 in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
96% (134)	98% (143)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a. New requirements for FCAT 2.0, including greater emphasis on grammar and spelling of common words as well as specific evidence and support required, decreased number students achieving 4.0 and higher. Also, student may no longer show evidence of understanding how to support by creating statistics or expert opinions; they must rely on anecdotal evidence and elaborations only for support. 1b.Changes in scoring and increased focus on particular areas for the writing exam, now the FCAT 2.0 Writing	1a.Assess the writing skills of each student at the beginning of grade 9 and at the end of first and second semesters. 1b.Complete baseline assessments of student writing at the start of each semester, with writing activities that focus on the areas of increased attention for FCAT 2.0 Writing: support (relevant, plausible), and basic conventions (esp. correct use of standard English conventions	1a. English teachers, Elise Vivenzo and Kathryn Ryan-Fores. 1.b.English teachers of 9th and 10th grades and Writing Coach Ryan-Fores	a.Pre/posttest comparison. 1.b.Writing pre-test/baseline assessment, compared to ongoing writing products throughout semester, culminating in a writing final assessment focusing on quality of support and strength of standard English conventions	1a.Florida Writes practice prompts. 1.b.FCAT 2.0 Writing (Florida Writes) practice prompts and rubric
2		2.a. Review state released test information and teaching strategies and disseminate to targeted ninth, tenth and eleventh grade teachers. 2. b. Conduct pull-out sessions with individual students or small groups depending on most urgent/common needs during block opposite of English	2.a. English teachers, Elise Vivenzo and Kathryn Ryan-Fores. 2.b.Ryan-Fores and English teacher	2.a.Teacher discussion, student input 2.b.Evaluating writing samples, comparison of writing products vertically and at baseline assessment at start of semester in English class	2. a. Florida Writes Rubric for practice prompts. 2.b.Composition assignments, FCAT 2.0 Writing prompts
	3.a. Limited focus on the expository, persuasive and argumentation modes of writing (outside the English classroom) for students to develop the appropriate skills	3a. Continue previous practices concentration on the 9th and 10th grade students scoring below 30%. Pull out 30% FCAT Writing Tutoring before and after school and on Saturdays. Spelling tests on	3.a. English teachers, Elise Vivenzo and Kathryn Ryan-Fores. Writing Coach Ryan-Fores and English teachers	3.a. Mini pre and post writing samples for lowest 30% students. 4.a. Address punctuation and sentence variety through diagramming sentences. Evaluating writing samples, comparison of	3.a. Mini pre and post tests on spelling rules, commonly misspelled words, diagramming sentences, forming complex sentences, organizational writing charts,

3		<p>commonly misspelled words each week.</p> <p>Teach diagramming sentences.</p> <p>Post and teach spelling rules.</p> <p>Pullout students below 4.0 on 8th grade FCAT Writes as well as 10th grade FCAT Prewriting test</p> <p>As per incoming Common Core Standards teach argumentation skills including problem/solution model.</p> <p>Conduct whole-group writing lessons and activities through content area classes</p> <p>Individualized student-teacher conferencing regarding writing progress and areas for improvement</p>	10th grade English teacher	<p>writing products vertically and at baseline assessment at start of semester in English class</p> <p>Comparison of writing samples across modes, grade levels, and grading periods.</p>	<p>use of prepositional, infinitive, participial, and gerund phrases, using literary devices, and creating elaborations.</p> <p>Composition assignments, FCAT 2.0 Writing prompts</p> <p>Writing portfolios</p>
---	--	--	----------------------------	---	---

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Common Core Standards English/Language Arts	9th – 12th Grade	Melissa Stapleton	School wide PLC, 9th -12th grade	Planning Days and Early Release	Feedback at meetings Marzano Observations	All high school teachers All Administrators

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Writing Tutoring, English Tutoring and other core subjects tutoring	Intensive tutoring throughout the school in preparation for testing	Magnet & School Accountability funds	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,500.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.		Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History will be at least 50%(75)			
U.S. History Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		50%(75)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Block scheduling	Offer tutoring before and after school.	History teacher	Evaluation included in all activities	Teacher made tests
---	------------------	---	-----------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------

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:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in U.S. History will be at least 20%(30)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	20%(30)

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 of literacy skills to read primary source documents	Common Core Training via Professional Learning Communities	Administration, Teachers, Department Head and Reading Coach	Monitor teacher participation in PLC Training Session	U.S. History EOC Exam results

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Common Core Standards English/Language Arts	9th -12th Grade	Chris Mimbs	School wide 11th - 12th Grades	Planning and Early Release Days	Feedback from PLC Meetings Marzano Observations	Feedback from PLC Meetings Marzano Observations

U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
EOC US History and other Social Science tutoring	Intensive tutoring throughout the school year	Magnet and School Accountability	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,000.00

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:	McFatter's attendance rate was 96.1%				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
96%	98%				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
21	20				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
160	156				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Family structure	1.1.Information sent to parents Re: attendance policy updates, official days allowed for absences, etc. 1.2.Attendance letters sent 5/10 days 1.3.Referred to social worker at 15 days absent	1.1.Cyd Dixon 1.2.Mary Romanski 1.3.Guidance counselors	1.1. DWH report review 1.2.Parent response 1.3.Parent response	1.1.Daily attendance pull 1.2.Attendance review 1.3.Attendance review

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
Faculty Meetings	9th -12th Grade	Administration	All High School Staff	Planning and other weekly meetings	Review at leadership team meetings	Administrators

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use Data Warehouse Reports	BCPS Data Management System	Not applicable	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Our goal is to decrease the number of in-school and out-of school suspensions by 50%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
6	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
6	3

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
12	6				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
10	5				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Increased number of students in dual enrollment, thus not on campus all day. 1.2 School rules re: closed campus	1.1. Security monitors to be at gates for all class dismissal. 1.2. Review with all classes during 1st week of schedule.	1.1. Security monitor 1.2. Admin., guidance counselors.	1.1. Review of numbers of referrals to admin 1.2. Q & A in classrooms	1.1. Review of attendance bulletin 1.2. Monthly attendance bulletin
2	1.3. Limited number of sports and other activities on campus	1.3. Increase student engagement through extra-curricular activities	1.3. Administrators, Teachers and Guidance Counselors	1.3. Review and monitor DMS Referrals	1.3. Reports in DMS

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
Faculty Meetings	9th -12th	Administrators	All High School staff	Planning Days and weekly mgts	Review at Leadership Team Meetings	Aministrators

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
BCPS Code of Student Conduct	BCPS School Discipline code	No cost at the school level	\$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:		McFatter Magnet HS continues to have a 100% graduation rate and 0% drop out rate. The school follows the guidelines of the Innovative Programs office as to enrollment.			
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:			
0%		0%			
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:			
100%		100%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Changes in student population due to lottery.	1.1.Enforce Innovative Programs guidelines	1.1. Magnet Coordinator, AP for high school	1.1.Review of data	1.1.Innovative Program report
2	1.2. School Based Credit Recovery Initiatives	1.2. Intensive instruction to assist students recovering credits in order to graduate on time	1.2. All High School Core Teachers Guidance Counselor Administration	1.2. Review 32 Credit Hour Report Monthly Intervention and support with students and parents	Data Warehouse Graduation Report Guidance Intervention Logs

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School based Credit Recovery	Intensive instruction to assist students with recovering credits through participation in our formalized Credit Recovery System	School Budget	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,000.00

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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>As a magnet school, students are drawn from throughout the South and Central areas of Broward County. With no boundaries, parent attendance varies as per activity. In 2011-2012, 85% of parents attended the tech night program, as revealed by sign - in sheet responses to technical program teachers. McFatter is not a Title 1 school.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85%	87%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parent attendance 1.2 Planning time 1.3. Tech teacher involvement 1.4. Printed materials 1.5. Weather 1.6. Student involvement	1.1. Time set early to bring parents after work; students to stay, not leave together. 1.2 Common planning for (3) tech teachers. 1.3 Meetings with high school tech teachers, scheduled, held. 1.4 Meet with tech students to prep for program. 1.5 Tri-fold document for publication, disbursement 1.6. Tables in mall area, under cover 1.7. Meetings with tech teachers.	1.1. Scott Kinghorn – Lead Teacher, Melissa Henley, Neil Rosenthal	1.1. Question and answer sessions. 1.2 Evaluation of Fair by teachers, parents, students. 1.3. Visualization 1.4. Participation	1.1. Sign in sheets at tables. 1.2 Tech contracts 1.3 Program matrix of selected areas. 1.4. Parent discussion 1.5. Sign in sheets
2	1.8. Expanded school boundary through the lottery system	1.8. Implement Parent Seminars	1.8. Ms. Daniel, Asst. Director Debbie Shotwell, Magnet Coordinator Guidance Counselors Elise Vivenco	1.8. Monitor parent and student participation	Feedback from parent surveys and sign-in sheets

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
Review of Tech Programs	10th	Scott Kinghorn	All Tech Teachers	Early Release and Planning Days	Review of student files	Scott Kinghorn

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		STEM Goal #1: Develop and implement lessons that require students to complete hands on projects that are aligned to STEM Careers STEM Goal #2: Provide access to alternative STEM education through field trips and extracurricular programs.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Newly instituted in Broward County this year	1. Allow teachers to attend training and work within their PLC to develop rigorous projects	Science Teachers	Evaluation of lessons created and feedback from peers	Student final projects
2	2.1. Lack of coordination/cooperation from external opportunities for the students to intern. 2.2. Lack of compensation for teachers/trainers 3.3. Lack of time (students, teachers and staff)	2.1. Increase communication and cooperation with area businesses and government agencies (both local and abroad) 2.2. Compensation (comp time and monetary) 2.3. Credit for students who participate.	2.1. Assistant Director and teachers	2.1. Research available opportunities for field trips and extracurricular activities 2.2. Poll students and teachers of interest in participation.	2.1. Feedback from students, teachers and staff of effectiveness.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	9th -12th	Chris Mimbs	School-wide 9th – 12th Grade	Planning and Early Release Days	Feedback from Meeting Marzano Observations	PLC Documentation All Administrators

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:		<p>Based on WDIS data, Work Force Development Information System, as of June 2012, the need was identified to increase the rate of supplemental gains through the attainment of completion point codes.</p> <p>The current completion rate for postsecondary students is 81% as measured by the Council on Occupational Education</p> <p>Our goal is to increase the completion rate to 3% by June 2012.</p>			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Post-Secondary Students seeking enrollments in Technical Programs are low functioning as measured by the Tests of Adult Basic Education, (TABE Test), Grade Levels: 0.0 – 5.9 and 6.0-12.9	1.1. Low Performing Post Secondary students will attend remediation in Vocation Preparatory Instruction Program (VPI) and Adult Basic Education (ABE).	1.1. Asst. Directors Dept. Chairs Post-Secondary Instructors Post-Secondary Guidance Counselors ESE Specialist	1.1. Classroom Walkthrough Observation Monthly meetings with Department Chairs and teachers to review Grade History Reports, Attendance Exceptions Reports, Student Target, Excessive Instructional Hours Report, LCP/OCP Reports and Program Completion Report. Students not making adequate progress will need to have a documented Teacher	1.1. WDIS Performance Reports which provide data on Program Completion and Occupational Completion Points earned by students enrolled in technical programs. Review PLC Survey results.

				Intervention and Contract	
2		1.2. Changes in South Florida Workforce	1.2. Identify the number of Post-Secondary students not making adequate progress as measured by the Program Completion and Occupational Completion Points (OCP) attainment.	1.3. Develop individual goals with department heads, instructors and key business partners to improve program quality and increase program completion 1.4. Post-Secondary instructors will maintain Business Advisory Committees in order to enhance the program for students and maintain our technical program accreditation. 1.5. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will be maintained to reflect on and formulate a plan for refining instructional strategies.	

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
Culinary Curriculum Building, eLearning & Accreditation	Post-Secondary	Chef Paul	Culinary Post Secondary Teachers	Data Chats midterm 5 times annually" PLC sessions on planning days and allowable early release days	Review materials and reports from CTACE and other WDIS Performance data. Review PLC Survey Results.	Dept. Chair Asst. Directors: Ellen Albano Cara Daniel Larry Rothman
PS Departmental PLC's	11th -12th & Post Secondary	Department Chairs	School Post Secondary PLC	Planning Days	Feedback from participants Marzano Observations	All Administrators

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)

Additional Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Additional Goal Goal Additional Goal Goal #1:			Increase the number of industry certifications earned by our CTE students		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
60%			70%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The financial burden of paying for industry certifications	Explore grant opportunities to pay for industry certifications for high school and post secondary students	Administrators, Leadership Team Members	Outcome of grant applications/rewards received	Industry certification performance 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
No Data Submitted						

Budget:

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

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

End of Additional Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FCAT Reading Camp and Core Area Tutoring	Provide before school, after school, during lunch and Saturday Tutoring	Magnet & School Accountability	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	EOC Geometry Tutoring and Other math Subjects	Geometry tutoring during throughout the school year in preparation for testing	Magnet School Accountability	\$2,500.00
Science	FCAT Science & EOC Exam Tutoring	Tutoring before, during lunch and after school	School Budget	\$1,500.00
Science	EOC Biology Tutoring and other Core Science subjects	Intensive tutoring throughout the school in preparation for EOC Testing	Magnet & School Accountability	\$1,500.00
Writing	FCAT Writing Tutoring, English Tutoring and other core subjects tutoring	Intensive tutoring throughout the school in preparation for testing	Magnet & School Accountability funds	\$1,500.00
U.S. History	EOC US History and other Social Science tutoring	Intensive tutoring throughout the school year	Magnet and School Accountability	\$2,000.00
Attendance	Use Data Warehouse Reports	BCPS Data Management System	Not applicable	\$0.00
Suspension	BCPS Code of Student Conduct	BCPS School Discipline code	No cost at the school level	\$0.00
Dropout Prevention	School based Credit Recovery	Intensive instruction to assist students with recovering credits through participation in our formalized Credit Recovery System	School Budget	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$13,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Secure funding in order to pay for SAT and ACT Testing for rising juniors that failed the FCAT 2.0 Reading tests	Students that are enrolled in reading classes are prepared and ready to take the SAT and/or ACT Test prior to the actual FCAT 2.0 Reading - Retakes	Magnet, School Accountability or School Budget	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$14,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

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
Our School Advisory Council funds will be used to enhance the educational opportunities of both the high school and post -secondary students	\$1,000.00

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

The School Advisory Committee meets several times per year to monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Based on the student performance data for both the high school programs and the Career, Technical & Adult Education programs, modifications are made to ensure we are meeting the objectives of our SIP. Additionally, the School Advisory Committee determines the allocation of the budget to support our School Improvement Plan performance goals.

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

Broward School District WILLIAM T. MCFATTER TECHNICAL CENTER 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	96%	94%	64%	332	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	68%	82%			150	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	90% (YES)			148	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					630	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District WILLIAM T. MCFATTER TECHNICAL CENTER 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	98%	98%	67%	344	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	75%	80%			155	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	96% (YES)			157	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					656	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested