

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: NORTH FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Jeff Spiro

SAC Chair: Cindy Tromley

Superintendent: Dr. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 11/12/2012

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	Jeffery Spiro	MS – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Certified School Principal K-12, History 6-12		12	2010-2011: B 2009-2010: B 2008-2009: C 2007-2008: C 2006-2007: C 2010-2011: Reading mastery = 59%, Math mastery = 87%, Writing mastery = 89%, Science mastery = 46%, did not meet AYP 2009-2010: Reading mastery = 62%, Math mastery = 84%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = 43%, did not meet AYP 2008-2009: Reading mastery = 58%, Math mastery= 81%, Writing mastery= 91%, and Science mastery= 35%, did not meet AYP 2007-2008: Reading mastery= 50%, Math mastery= 80%, Writing mastery= 89%, Science mastery= 32%, did not meet AYP 2006-2007: Reading mastery= 46%, Math mastery= 73%, Writing mastery= 87%, Science mastery= 33%, did not meet AYP 2005-2006: Reading mastery= 43%, Math mastery= 75%, Writing mastery= 87%, did not meet AYP

					<p>2004-2005: Reading mastery= 37%, Math mastery: 71%, Writing mastery= 91%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2003-2004: Reading mastery: 39%, Math mastery: 67%, Writing mastery: 90%</p> <p>2002-2003: Reading mastery= 41%, Math mastery= 65%, Writing mastery= 90%</p> <p>2001-2002: Reading mastery= 35%, Math mastery= 60%, Writing mastery= 91%</p>
Assis Principal	John Drake	MS – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Certified Elementary Education 1-6, School Principal K-12, Middle Grades Social Science 5-9.	15	23	<p>2010-2011: A</p> <p>2009-2010: B</p> <p>2008-2009: A</p> <p>2007-2008: A</p> <p>2006-2007: C</p> <p>2005-2006: B</p> <p>2004-2005: D</p> <p>2003-2004: C</p> <p>2002-2003: C</p> <p>2001-2002: C</p> <p>2000-2001: C</p> <p>1999-2000: C</p> <p>2010-2011: Reading mastery = 59%, Math mastery = 87%, Writing mastery = 89%, Science mastery = 46%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2009-2010: Reading mastery = 62%, Math mastery = 84%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = 43%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2008-2009: Reading mastery = 58%, Math mastery= 81%, Writing mastery= 91%, and Science mastery= 35%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2007-2008: Reading mastery= 50%, Math mastery= 80%, Writing mastery= 89%, Science mastery= 32%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2006-2007: Reading mastery= 46%, Math mastery= 73%, Writing mastery= 87%, Science mastery= 33%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2005-2006: Reading mastery= 43%, Math mastery= 75%, Writing mastery= 87%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2004-2005: Reading mastery= 37%, Math mastery: 71%, Writing mastery= 91%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2003-2004: Reading mastery: 39%, Math mastery: 67%, Writing mastery: 90%</p> <p>2002-2003: Reading mastery= 41%, Math mastery= 65%, Writing mastery= 90%</p> <p>2001-2002: Reading mastery= 35%, Math mastery= 60%, Writing mastery= 91%</p>
Assis Principal	Daman Essert	M.Ed. - Ed Leadership, Florida Gulf Coast University; Certified Educational Leadership K-12.		2	<p>2010-2011: A</p> <p>2009-2010: A</p>
Assis Principal	Steve Casolino	MS – Ed Leadership, USF, certified Administration & Supervision 7-12, Social Science 6-12	9	9	<p>2010-2011: A</p> <p>2009-2010: B</p> <p>2008-2009: A</p> <p>2007-2008: A</p> <p>2006-2007: C</p> <p>2005-2006: B</p> <p>2004-2005: D</p> <p>2003-2004: C</p> <p>2010-2011: Reading mastery = 59%, Math mastery = 87%, Writing mastery = 89%, Science mastery = 46%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2009-2010: Reading mastery = 62%, Math mastery = 84%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = 43%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2008-2009: Reading mastery = 58%, Math mastery= 81%, Writing mastery= 91%, and Science mastery= 35%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2007-2008: Reading mastery= 50%, Math mastery= 80%, Writing mastery= 89%, Science mastery= 32%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2006-2007: Reading mastery= 46%, Math mastery= 73%, Writing mastery= 87%, Science mastery= 33%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2005-2006: Reading mastery= 43%, Math mastery= 75%, Writing mastery= 87%, did not meet AYP</p> <p>2004-2005: Reading mastery= 37%, Math mastery: 71%, Writing mastery= 91%, did not meet AYP</p>
Assis Principal	Kristine Sund	MS – Ed Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Certified School Leadership K-12,			

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Kelley Newhouse	M.Ed.- Secondary Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Certified in English 5-9 and 6-12; Journalism 6-12; Endorsements: Reading, ESOL, and Middle Grades	10	3	This is Ms. Newhouse's third year as an instructional coach. 2011-2012: Reading mastery = 68%, Math mastery = 73%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = N/A, did not meet AYP
Literacy	Heidi Van Waus	BS-Primary & Elementary Ed. Certifications: ESOL and Reading Endorsement	1	2	This is Ms. Van Waus's second year as an instructional coach. 2011-2012: Reading mastery = 68%, Math mastery = 73%, Writing mastery = 92%, Science mastery = N/A, did not meet AYP

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	Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal (AP)	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff	Administration	Ongoing	
3	Data analysis -- gain scores	Administration	Ongoing	
4	Ensure staff participation in trainings, coursework, or professional development.	Administration	Ongoing	
5	Follow up with all new or out of field staff to ensure attendance/participation in all required professional development.	Administration	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 Out-of-field Teachers 6 Teachers still need to earn ESOL endorsement 0 Non-effective Teachers	Assistant Principal will communicate with teachers when district ESOL courses are available for enrollment through Curriculum and Staff Development. We will encourage and communicate expectations of completion regularly with these teachers.

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
92	7.6%(7)	13.0%(12)	37.0%(34)	42.4%(39)	32.6%(30)	90.2%(83)	17.4%(16)	2.2%(2)	21.7%(20)

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
Laurie Wray	James Cole; Kristin Williams	Common Planning	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly during planning or after school to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.
Clair Flynn	Kathleen Linn	Common Planning	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly during planning or after school to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.
Kristine Trueblood	Danielle Thompson	Common Planning	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly during planning or after school to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.
Kelley Newhouse	Anna Sheffield; William Sandifer	Common Planning	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly during planning or after school to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching, and planning.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team for North Fort Myers High School consists of the following members:
Kelley Newhouse, Literacy coach
Patty Wiley, Classroom teacher
Mike Sushil, Guidance Counselor
Joy Marks, Technology Specialist
Ellen Phillips, Speech-Language Pathologist
Cheryl Acevedo, ESE Specialist
Trevor Montgomery, ESE teacher
M.J. Mojica, Social Worker
Lourdes Ballara, ESOL teacher
Daman Essert, Assistant Principal

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

The MTSS Leadership team at North Fort Myers High School meets on a monthly basis to analyze school and/or student data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual. The roles of

each member are as follows:

Kelley Newhouse, Literacy Coach

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR assessment data, FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Support implementation of interventions designed by MTSS Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Monitor instructional interventions

Patty Wiley, classroom teacher

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

Ellen Phillips, Speech-Language Pathologist

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

Daman Essert, Assistant Principal

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

Mike Sushil, Guidance Counselor

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary MTSS forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

Trevor Montgomery, ESE Teacher

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

Cheryl Acevedo, Specialist (Behavior)

- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

M.J. Mojica, Social Worker

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

Lourdes Ballara, ESOL/ELL Representative

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

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

North Fort Myers High School utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school,

classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Students who need support have been assigned mentors who meet with the students weekly. They each have a data folder which tracks their grades weekly. Administration provides staff trainings during Tuesday faculty meetings assist with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs. Additional staff members have been hired to support these students within the classroom setting as well.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Jeff Spiro, Principal
Kelley Newhouse, Literacy Coach
Daman Essert, Assistant Principal
Kristine Sund, Assistant Principal
Patty Wiley, English department head
Laurie Wray, Math department head
Claire Flynn, English teacher
Adam Molloy, Social Studies department head
Diane Mirro, Reading teacher
Jim Melvin, Science department head
Judith Cintron, Foreign Language
Trevor Montgomery, ESE teacher
Lisa Skinner, Language Arts teacher
Heidi Van Waus, Literacy Coach
Barbara Teitelzweig, Language Arts/Dual Enrollment
Tiffany Bucher, History teacher/AVID coordinator

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

Led by the Literacy Coaches, the LLT meets the fourth Friday of each month to discuss reading initiatives, particularly reading in the content areas. The LLT also analyzes data collected from baseline tests in the content areas, cold reads in reading classes and 9th and 10th grade English classes, Empower3000, and FAIR for progress monitoring. In addition, the LLT discusses and plans the monthly staff professional development/in-service. Moreover, the LLT discusses pressing issues/areas of concern school-wide as well as solutions.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year are to develop and carry out the monthly staff professional development that will focus on reading strategies and modeling the strategy for all teachers in the classroom, as well as collect and review reading data to determine strengths and weaknesses of our lowest 25% in reading. Data analysis and teacher need will drive professional development. Areas such as vocabulary, higher-level questioning, student engagement, and text complexity will be a focus this year. The LLT will provide support to teachers to increase awareness of the Common Core State Standards and implementation in classrooms in order to prepare students for college and careers and for the 2014-15 change in assessment.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Three times a month staff members are engaged in professional learning through the literacy cycle. Teachers are provided with a best practices reading strategy for either the reading coach or faculty expert. Staff members then have to select between, modeling the lesson and with reading coach observation, or watch the reading coach model a lesson using the reading strategy. These activities are monitored by the administration through classroom walkthrough and artifact evidence from the reading coach.

*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?

North Fort Myers High School is committed to providing a curriculum that emphasizes real-world hands-on learning activities and labs through a variety of courses across content areas. The majority of teachers on staff have been trained through Cambridge courses which emphasize critical thinking and a problem-solving approach to coursework.

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?

The guidance counselor staff and Assistant Principal for Curriculum at North Fort Myers High School are committed to advising each and every student on their career path and assisting them with planning for their future by offering a diverse curriculum that will prepare students for the professions with the highest job growth, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. NFMHS utilizes the CHOICES software program to target student career interests, and each student completes an Epep to assist advisors in targeting individual student needs and interests.

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](#)

With the addition of the Cambridge AICE program, North High is committed to encouraging students to take AP, AICE, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans. This will include sharing information and requirements to become eligible for Bright Futures. During common planning, teachers will review charts tracking graduation requirements and Bright Futures requirements and intervene as necessary.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the end of 2012-2013 school year, 70% of our students will score at Level 3 in FCAT Reading while maintaining or increasing the percentage at Levels 4/5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%	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	Increased rigor of FCAT 2.0	The school will provide literacy model lessons and implement lesson study in all content areas in order to focus on best practices to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition.	Administration and Literacy Coach	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:		In 2011-2012 school year 36% of 9th graders and 38% of 10th graders scored a level 4-5. At the end of 2012-2013, we will increase to 40% of 9th graders and 42% of 10th graders will score level 4 or above.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
36% in 9th grade 38% in 10th grade		40% in 9th grade 42% in 10th grade			
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	Increased rigor on the FCAT.	Staff training on level of Depth of knowledge and selecting higher level text.	Administration Literacy Coach	Observation and on-going progress monitoring	FCAT 2.0

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		In 2011-12, 69% of our students made learning gains on FCAT Reading. In 2012-13, we will improve to 72% as measured by the FCAT Reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
69%		72%			
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	Increased rigor on FCAT	Staff training on level of Depth of knowledge and selecting higher level text.	Administraion Literacy Coaches	On-Going progress monitoring	FCAT Reading

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's specific disabilities and health concerns and being able to complete the FAA in a timely manner.	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures.	ESE Staff members	On-going progress monitoring and observation	FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-12 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 69% of learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%	69%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of new Reading Curriculum	Provide Professional Development, Lesson Study groups, and support from Literacy Coaches.	Administration and Literacy Coaches	On-Going Progress Monitoring through Empower 3000 and classroom assessments	Empower 3000 data reports and data analysis of classroom assessment data

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

Reading Goal #

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

A 3% increase of proficient students annually for the next 5 years.

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68%	71%	74%	77%	80%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2011-12 only 61% of Hispanics scored at or above grade level in reading. In 12-13 Hispanics will improve to 64% as measured FCAT Reading. White students achieved at 68%, increase to 71%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 68%, Hispanic: 61%, Asian: 68%, Black: 52%, ELL: 8%, SWD: 29%, ED: 61%	White: 71%, Hispanic: 64%, Asian: 71%, Black: 57%, ELL: 17%, SWD: 35%, ED: 64%

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 rigor on FCAT Reading	Lesson Study meetings, Literacy Cycle meetings, and Monthly SIP goal teams	Administration and Reading Coaches	Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule.	FAIR assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In 2011-12, 37% of our ELL students made learning gains in reading. Also, in 2011-12, 41% of ELL students scored in levels 3, 4, or 5 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test. In 2012-13, we will increase from 37% to 41% making learning gains as measured by FCAT reading. In 2012-13, at least 45% of ELL students will score in levels 3, 4, or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% making learning gains 41% Levels 3, 4, or 5	41% making learning gains 45% Levels 3, 4, or 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	Language barriers, new reading curriculum	Provide additional time and support for ELL students	Administration Literacy coaches ELL teachers	Review of FAIR and Empower 3000 data	FAIR Empower 3000

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making	
---	--

satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:		In 2011-12, 34% of our SWD students made learning gains in reading. In 2012-13, we will increase from 34% to 35% making learning gains as measured by FCAT reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
34%		35%			
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's specific disabilities and health concerns	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures.	ESE staff members ESE Staffing Specialist	On-going progress monitoring	FAIR and classroom assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:		In 2011-12, only 57% of economically disadvantaged students scored at or above grade level in reading. In 12-13 economically disadvantaged students will improve at to 64% as measured by FCAT/FAA reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
57%		64%			
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 background knowledge	Teachers will build background knowledge before teaching a lesson.	All teachers	on-going progress monitoring	classroom assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core; Text Complexity; Higher-Level Questioning; Student Engagement; Vocabulary	9-12	Administration; Literacy Coaches; Literacy Leadership Team; Lesson Study Facilitators	All Lesson Study Groups; School-wide	Monthly in-service/workshop; Three times a month in Lesson Study Groups on extended days	Observations; lesson plans; lesson study group notes; progress monitoring through classroom assessments	Administration; Literacy Coaches; Teachers

WICOR strategies	9th-12th	PD facilitator; Literacy Coaches	All teachers	monthly	observations	administration
------------------	----------	----------------------------------	--------------	---------	--------------	----------------

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
AVID Summer Conference	National Trainer	Title II	\$4,260.00
			Subtotal: \$4,260.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$4,260.00

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.		In 2011-12, 42% (10) of students scored proficient on the CELLA listening/speaking test. In 2012-13, we will improve to 45% (11) proficiency.			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
42% (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	Language; new reading curriculum	provide scaffolding and differentiated instruction	Teachers; administration; ESOL chair	ongoing progress monitoring	classroom assessments

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:		In 2011-12, 24% (6) of students scored proficient in reading as measured on CELLA. In 2012-13, we will improve the percentage to 28% (7).			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
24%					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language; new reading curriculum	Scaffolding and differentiated instruction	Teachers; administrators; ESOL chair	ongoing progress monitoring	classroom assessments

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:		In 2011-12, 25% (6) of students scored proficient on the writing section of CELLA. In 2012-13, we will improve this percentage to 28% (7).			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
25%					
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	Written language; vocabulary; grammar; syntax	Scaffolding; differentiated instruction	Teachers; administrators; ESOL chair	ongoing progress monitoring	classroom assessments

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's specific disabilities and health concerns and being able to complete the FAA in a timely manner.	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures	ESE staff members	On-going Progress monitoring	FAA

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's specific disabilities and health concerns and being able to complete the FAA in a timely manner.	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures.	ESE staff members	On-going Progress monitoring	FAA

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

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				

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By the end of 2012-20103, we will meet the AMO goal as listed below.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 54%, Hispanic: 43%, White: 51%, SWD: 38%, ED: 48%	Black: 58%, Hispanic: 48%, White: 55%, SWD: 43%, ED: 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
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:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal E:				
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:	Increase the percent of students scoring level 3-5 from 59% to 64% as measured by the Algebra I EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	64%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Staff Turnover	Lesson Study Process to assist new staff members to accommodate Algebra EOC goals	Math department Administration	Lesson Study; lesson plans	Classroom walkthroughs and observation
2	New Standards	Algebra Fantasy League	Math Department	Lesson Study; lesson plans	Classroom observations

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in Algebra to 15%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10%	15%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not sufficiently prepared due to overlapping requirements in the curriculum.	Complete academic plan with some modifications	Math department	lesson plans	EOC; classroom assessments

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	By the end of the 2012-2013, 68% of our students taking the Geometry EOC will meet or exceed the State average as measured by the Florida EOC Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% of our students are on the top two-thirds of the Geometry EOC	maintain or exceed 68%

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 Algebra I knowledge and requirements to pass the EOC.	Differentiated instruction and cooperative learning groups to allow students to assist each other in mastery of knowledge.	math department	lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs	EOC
2	Pacing of curriculum and getting through the Academic Plan	Spiraling standards throughout the year in all assessments to assist with mastery.	math department	lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs; PLC meetings	EOC; classroom walkthrough observations
3	Levels of complexity of questions on the EOC	Weekly enrichments designed to offer students higher level thinking experiences.	math department	lesson plans-showing higher level questions embedded within the lesson	EOC; classroom walkthrough observations
4	New Standards	Geometry Fantasy League	math department	Lesson study; lesson plans	classroom observations

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	In 2012-13, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the top third in Geometry to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% scoring in the top third	43% scoring in the top third

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
Teachers attend AICE training	9th-12th Math	National trainer	9th-12th grade math teachers	November 2012 and December 2012	Classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Administration
Math teachers participating in Lesson Study groups	9th through 12th	Math Department head	All math teachers 9th-12th grades	Monthly during 2012-2013 school year	Classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Administration and Math department head
SMART Board Training	9th-12th grade Math	District trainer	9th-12th grade math teachers	October 1st and 2nd 2012	classroom walkthroughs	Administration
WICOR strategies	9th-12th	PD facilitator	All teachers	monthly	observations	Adminstration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
AVID	National Trainer	Title II	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,000.00

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.		In 2011-12, 58% of students scored at levels 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA Science. In 2012-13, we will increase the percent to 61% as measured on the FAA Science			
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
58%		61%			
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's specific disabilities and health concerns and being able to complete the FAA in a timely manner	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures.	ESE staff members Staffing Specialist	ongoing progress monitoring	FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.		In 2011-12, 42% of students scored at or above level 7 in science as measured on the FAA. In 2012-13, we will increase the percent to 45% as measured on the FAA.			
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
42%		45%			
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's specific disabilities and health concerns and being able to complete the FAA in a timely manner	provide necessary accommodations; provide mock exams to acclimate students exam procedures.	ESE staff members ESE staffing specialist	ongoing progress monitoring	FAA

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.	In 2012-2013, 60% of students taking the Biology 1 EOC will meet or exceed the State average as measured by the Florida EOC Assessments.
Biology Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

60% of students are on the top two-thirds of Biology EOC			meet or exceed 60%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No prior exemplars/exams, from the state, to use as a reference. Presentation, language and format of the test.	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5E model, science stations.	Administration and Science department head	The created lab schedule will be implemented with fidelity and monitored by administration	Performance on the science common assessments.
2	Levels of complexity questions on the EOC	Create essential questions that engage students with the content.	Science department	classroom observations	EOC; lesson plans-showing higher level complexity questions

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	In 2011-12, 40% of students scored in the top third in biology. In 2012-13, we will increase the number of students scoring in the top third to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%	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	No prior exemplars/exams, from the state, to use as a reference. Presentation, language and format of the test.	Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5E model, science stations.	Science department head	The created lab schedule will be implemented with fidelity and monitored by administration	Performance on the science common assessments.
2	Levels of complexity questions on the EOC	Create essential questions that engage students with the content.	Science department	classroom observations	EOC; lesson plans-showing higher level complexity questions

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

Teachers will attend AICE training	9th-12th, Science	National trainer	9th-12th Science teachers	November 2012	classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Administration
SMART Board	9th-12th grade teachers	District trainer	All science teachers	October 2012	classroom walkthroughs	Administration
Vernier probeware	All 9-12; Science	Science Department head and technology specialist	All science teachers	November 2012	Student samples and review of student data collected by probeware	Administration and science department head

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
AICE Training	National Trainer	Title II	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		In 2011-12 51% scored at level 4.0 or higher in FCAT Writing. In 12-13, we will improve to 56% scoring 4.0 or higher as measured by FCAT Writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
51%		56%			
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
	Increased rigor of FCAT writing	Administer FCAT Writes mirror test to 10th	Administration, Language Arts	Review of mirror test results to determine	FCAT Writes and Lee Writes mirror

1	grade students and Lee Writes mirror test to 9th grade students mirror test to	department chair, and literacy coordinator	areas of need before the FCAT Writing test	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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write Traits	9th-10th; Language Arts	Teacher trainer	All Language Arts teachers	November 2012	Student samples, lesson plans, and classroom walkthroughs	Administration and teacher-trainer

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	In 2012-13, we will have 60% of students achieve proficiency on US History EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	60% 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	First year of testing examination	teacher workshops using EOC materials	History department	classroom walktroughs; ongoing assessments	US History EOC

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	
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
AICE training	9th-12th	National Trainer	All History teachers	December 2012	classroom walkthroughs, Lesson Study	Adiminstration: AICE Coordinator

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	In 2011-12, NFMHS had 2,636 un-excused absences. In 2012-13, we will decrease the number of un-excused absences from 2,636 to 2,500.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2,636 Un-excused Absences	2,500 Un-excused
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

174	160				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
2	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	Earlier start time	Parent and student education on new start time; daily monitoring of absences and tardies.	Student Services; administration	ongoing monitoring	Pinnacle

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						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
AP conference	National Trainer	Title II	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	In 2011-2012, NFMHS had 209 out of school suspensions. In 2012-13, we will decrease to 189 out of school suspensions.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
166	160			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
166	160			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
209	189			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
209	189			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	In 2011-2012, our graduation rate was 94%. In 2012-2013, we will increase the graduation rate to 96%.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2 students	0 students
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

94%			96%		
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 credit requirement toward graduation	Offer a credit recovery course during the school day.	Administration, guidance counselors	Dropout & Graduation rates	Mainframe reports
2	Seniors not passing required courses.	Guidance Counselors will meet with students individually to discuss grades & graduation requirements. Parents receive a letter to inform them that their child is not meeting graduation requirements.	Guidance Counselors	Dropout & Graduation rates	Semester Grading Reports

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		In 2011-2012, NFMHS had 6,400 recorded parent contacts. In 2012-2013, NFMHS will increase to 7,000 parent contacts.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
6,400		7,000			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents updating parent contact information with the school.	Increase awareness of school events and parent involvement activities.	Administration	Increased parent involvement	Total number of calls placed.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			In 2012-13, we will increase the number of students enrolled in advanced science and mathematics courses from 240 students currently enrolled to 300 students enrolled.		
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 interest and ability to complete advanced science and math courses.	Offer more advanced science and math courses	APC	Master Schedule	Master Schedule

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:		In 2012-13, we will increase the number of students receiving Industry Certifications from 250 students to 300 students.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New software adopted during the 2012-2013 school year	Teacher Training	District trainer	Number of certifications earned by students	certifications earned

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Parent Community Involvement Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Parent Community Involvement Goal Parent Community Involvement Goal #1:		North Fort Myers High school will increase the number of parent and community volunteer hours from 7,849 hours to a minimum of 8,000 hours during the 12-13 school year.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
7,849 hours		8,000 hours			
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	Parent awareness of school events and volunteer opportunities	Parent Link phone calls	Administration	Parent Link records	Parent Link

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 Parent Community Involvement Goal(s)

Anti-Bullying Goal:

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

1. Anti-Bullying Goal Anti-Bullying Goal #1:	The goal is to maintain zero instances of bullying during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
During the 2011-2012 school year North Fort Myers High school had zero documented cases of bullying.	Zero documented cases of bullying

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 reporting instances of bullying	Teacher and staff awareness of bully prevention.	Assistant principal and guidance departments.	Teacher professional development.	Pinnacle analytics

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 Anti-Bullying Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	AVID Summer Conference	National Trainer	Title II	\$4,260.00
Mathematics	AVID	National Trainer	Title II	\$2,000.00
Science	AICE Training	National Trainer	Title II	\$500.00
Attendance	AP conference	National Trainer	Title II	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$7,260.00
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: \$7,260.00

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 9/20/2012)

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
School Improvement funds will be spent to directly support school improvement goals when/if the funds are allocated to schools.	\$0.00

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

The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will give advice concerning the annual school budget, will approve the use of the school improvement funds, DAC meeting agendas, reviewing current curriculum, course availabilities, update of Arts and Media programs and performances, AICE program updates, testing requirements, state standards, and school goals. The SAC members will have the opportunity each month to add topics to the agenda as needed.

The SAC members will recognize outstanding business partnerships as they contribute to North Fort Myers High School. The SAC members will also work on increasing participation, volunteer hours, and community business partnerships which will result in the Five Star Award for the 2012-2013 school year.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District NORTH FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	59%	87%	89%	46%	281	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	56%	81%			137	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	45% (NO)	65% (YES)			110	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					538	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District NORTH FORT MYERS HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	62%	84%	92%	43%	281	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	57%	77%			134	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	39% (NO)	65% (YES)			104	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					529	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested