FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: YOUTH CO-OP PREPARATORY HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Frank Valladares

SAC Chair: Esther Reyes

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: October 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Kenneth Feria	Educational Leadership, Biology	1	7	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A AYP N Y N N High Standards Rdg. 46 37 55 48 48 High Standards Math 73 93 84 79 81 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 51 61 58 62 Lrng Gains Mth 72 91 84 80 84 Gains-Rdg-25% 83 61 55 75 72 Gains-Mth-25% 86 90 81 61 59

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.

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Andrea Jimenez	Science, Reading	1	7	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A A AYP Y Y Y Y High Standards Rdg. 81 79 81 82 79 High Standards Math 80 78 78 74 75 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 81 76 75 77 71 Lrng Gains Mth 81 76 75 72 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 78 73 79 75 66 Gains-Mth-25% 79 74 68 79 62

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Beginning/New teacher workshops and conference 2. Professional development opportunities will be conducted on campus for teachers based on the needs of the school as well as teacher interests. 3. Solicit referrals from employees and our sister school Youth Co-op Charter School 4. Mentoring Program with veteran staff.	Principal Principal Principal Principal	August, 2012 On-going On-going On-going	

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
1	Board has approved waiver and teacher is working towards meeting requirements for highly effective status. School is facilitating collaboration between this instructional staff member and the in-field member from our sister school. Meetings with administration to discuss student data and progress and recommend resources. Facilitate completion of required coursework to meet highly-effective status.

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
5	0.0%(0)	80.0%(4)	20.0%(1)	0.0%(0)	40.0%(2)	80.0%(4)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

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

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)

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

• Principal: will provide support and ensure all resources will be allocated appropriately, ensure proper implementation of interventions, provide professional development, observe and assess school staff and communicate with stakeholders plans and activities regarding RtI.
• Leadership Team: Provides support in guiding classroom instruction, assists with analyzing data, identifies appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies.
• Select General Education Teachers: (Primary and Intermediate) will provide feedback regarding core instruction, collect data, identify strengths and weaknesses in student achievement and provide appropriate interventions.
• SPED teacher: Participate in student data collection and collaborates with regular education teachers while providing additional support through regular consultations.

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?

RTI team members will meet bi-weekly with all teachers in order to communicate and collaborate on strategies to be implemented to improve student achievement in areas identified as weaknesses through a variety of data.

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 teachers selected for the RTI team gathered and analyzed student data in order to determine the effectiveness of the strategies being implemented in the classrooms. Then the complete RTI team collaborated in order to modify the strategies/resources from all departments. The new goals and action plans were then included in the School Improvement Plan draft.

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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

o adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
o adjust the delivery of behavior management system
o adjust the allocation of school-based resources
o drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
o create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
Baseline Assessment, prior year FCAT scores, and Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network.
Midyear: Progress Monitoring: PMRN, District Interim Assessments.
End of the year: FCAT, District Interim Assessments, and CELLA
2. Managed data will include:

Academic
• FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory
• Oral Reading Fluency Measures
• Baseline Benchmark Assessments
• Progress Reports
• Interim assessments
• State/Local Math and Science assessments
• FCAT
• Student grades
• School site specific assessments

Behavior
• Student Case Management System

- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be conducted during opening of school meetings in August, and small sessions throughout the school year including data analysis of FCAT, District Interim Assessments, and CELLA. Based on the ongoing needs of the staff, further professional development will be provided.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Provide Opening of School Training to introduce school-wide plan. Identify roles and duties of members/groups. Hold regular meetings to determine effectiveness and offer suggestions for improvement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

• Administration: Kenneth Feria (Principal)-Ensure that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation is kept, provides adequate professional development through the use of Professional Development Plans (PDP) to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
• Reading Coach: Ms. Andrea Jimenez – monitor and communicate data gathered from district assessments, FAIR, DIBELS, school based assessments. Oversee and coordinate the reading intervention program.
• Select General Education Teacher: Esther Reyes (Intensive Reading teacher), Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement curriculum and intervention when needed.
• Special Education (SPED) teachers: Jacqueline Corcho (SPED Teacher) - Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials, collaborates with general education teachers while providing additional support through regular consultations and ensure that student accommodations are being met as per their Individualized Educational Plan (IEP).

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

The LLT will review progress by monitoring data gathered school wide. The team will identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will then identify strategies to better assist students' specific needs. During the meetings, the team will also desegregate data. The team will collaborate bi-weekly in order to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation and make decisions to ensure that all student needs are being met.

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

The LLT will ensure that all students are making adequate progress in reading.

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

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

Reading Strategies are implemented in all content areas. All staff is afforded the opportunity to participate in the applicable PD. The Literacy Leadership Team monitors the implementation of literacy strategies across the curriculum.

*High Schools Only

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

During the 2012-2013 school year,Youth Co-Op Preparatory School will gather data from student surveys in order to build academies which will motivate students to prepare themselves for their future careers. A college and career fair will be held to help students familiarize themselves with the requirements of each field.

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?

Youth Co-op Prep makes a student's course of study personally meaningful by having students complete interest and career inventories, holding individual data chats, and offering a diverse program consisting of regular, honors, and advanced classes, as well as honor societies and interest clubs. In addition, a college and career fair will be held to further discuss requirements and help students make informed decisions about their future.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Include group and project-based learning in all areas of instruction to help foster higher level thinking and organizational skills for success in postsecondary education.

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:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The high school District average on the 2012 FCAT indicates that 25% of students scored at Level 3. Our school goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25%(17)	30%(20)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Based on District results, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading was reporting category: Vocabulary with only 63% of the questions in this section answered correctly.	The following instructional strategies will be used: • Vocabulary Word Maps • Context Clues • Reading from a Variety of Texts	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed. In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented.	Formative: Reading Plus Quarterly and Interim Assessments Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
2	Based on District results,another area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading was reporting category: Literary Analysis with 64% of the questions in this section answered correctly.	The following instructional strategies will be used: • graphic organizers; • concept maps; • open compare/contrast; • signal or key words (e.g., since, because, after, while, both, however); and • reading from a wide variety of texts. Language Arts classrooms will use the College Based SpringBoard curriculum to incorporate these strategies.	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed. In addition, Administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented.	Formative: Reading Plus Quarterly and Interim Assessments Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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:	As a new school, we will use the District averages to establish the current and expected performance. The high school District average on the 2012 FCAT indicates that 28% of students scored at or above Level 4 in Reading. Our school goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 or above to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (15)	30% (20)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	CRISS and the College Board SpringBoard curriculum will be implemented Use of newspapers, magazines, and poems. Project-based learning and use of thematic units.	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed. In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented	Formative: Quarterly Interim Assessments Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This	CRISS and the College Board SpringBoard curriculum will be implemented Use of newspapers, magazines, and poems.	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to	Formative: Quarterly Interim Assessments Summative: Results of the

| 2 | was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%). | Project-based learning and use of thematic units. | implementation of the identified strategies. | instruction as needed.

In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented. | 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment |

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:	The District results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 68% of students made learning gains. The school goal for the 2012-2013 schools year is to increase the percent of students achieving learning gains to 73 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (46)	73%(49)

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 area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	The school will implement the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Program and the College Based SpringBoard curriculum across all Language Arts classess. Use of FAIR data to guide instruction and target vocabulary and literary analysis deficiencies	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Reports and FAIR results. Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	The school will implement the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Program and the College Based SpringBoard curriculum across all Language Arts classess. Use of FAIR data to guide instruction and target vocabulary and literary analysis deficiencies	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Reports and FAIR results. Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
3					

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

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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 District results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 70% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains The school goal for the 2012-2013 schools year is to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains to 75%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(12)	75%(13)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This	Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs. Placement in Intensive	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the	Bi-weekly review of Reading programs to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data

	was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Reading Course and Saturday Tutoring Program	implementation of the identified strategies.		Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
2	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs. Placement in Intensive Reading Course and Saturday Tutoring Program	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading programs to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florida Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. Because this is the school's first year, District results are shown. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	58	62	66	69	73	

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:	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students in each category by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District White: 77 Black: 42 Hispanic: 61 Asian: 79 American Indian: 63	District White: 79 Black: 48 Hispanic: 64 Asian: 81 American Indian: 67

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Placement in Intensive Reading Course and Saturday Academy. Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florida Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This	Placement in Intensive Reading Course and Saturday Academy. Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	5B.1. Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florida Assessment In Reading (FAIR)

2	was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Programs	implementation of the identified strategies.		data

Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment |
| 3 | The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%). | Placement in Intensive Reading Course and Saturday Academy. Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs | The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies. | Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary | 5B.1. Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data

Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5C:	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students in each category by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District
42%	District
48%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Placement in Intensive Reading Course, Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Readin Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data.

Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment |
| 2 | The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%). | Placement in Intensive Reading Course, Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs | The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies. | Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary | Formative: Readin Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data.

Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment |

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making	

satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5D:

	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students in each category by 50%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 32%	District 38%

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 area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Placement in Intensive Reading Course, Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data. Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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 goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students in each category by 50%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 51%	District 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
1	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Placement in Intensive Reading Course, Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data. Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
2	The area earning the lowest mean score for the District in 2012 was Vocabulary with 5 out of 8 points answered correctly (62.5%). This was followed by Literary Analysis with 7 out of 11 points earned (63.6%).	Placement in Intensive Reading Course, Implementation of the Reading Plus and Jamestown Reading Programs	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Bi-weekly review of Reading Plus to ensure that the students are making adequate progress and make changes when necessary	Formative: Reading Plus Performance Reports and Florid Assessment In Reading (FAIR) data. Summative: Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading

Assessment

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 fo Monitoring
Reading Plus	9th Grade Language Arts Teacher	Reading Plus Facilitator	9th Grade Language Arts Teacher	One Scheduled Meeting: October 3, 2012 Scheduled Meetings: August 7 – 9, 2012	Reading Plus Generated Reports	Administration
SpringBoard Training	9th Grade Language Arts Teacher	SpringBoard Facilitator	9th Grade Language Arts Teacher		Walkthroughs	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Project-based Learning and Thematic Units. Development of Reading Skills	SpringBoard Curriculum Jamestown	FTE FTE	$1,525.00
			Subtotal: $1,525.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Development of Reading Skills	Reading Plus	FTE	$1,200.00
			Subtotal: $1,200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Development of Reading Skills Project-based Learning and Thematic Units	Training on Reading Plus SpringBoard Curriculum	FTE FTE	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reinforcement of Concepts. Drill & Practice. Test-taking Skills.	Saturday Academy	Grant	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
			Grand Total: $5,725.00

End of Reading Goa

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:	The 2012 District results of the CELLA Test indicate that 45% of students who were tested were proficient in the areas of listening and speaking. The school goal for the 2012-2013 schools year is to increase the percent of proficient students to 50%.			

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

District Results 45%(30634)

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 responses show deficiencies in listening/speaking skills.	Use Substitution, Expansion, Paraphrase, and Repetition in daily lessons	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Progress monitoring through quarterly assessments	End-of-the-Year CELLA Assessment

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The 2012 District results of the CELLA Test indicate that 28% of students who were tested were proficient in the area of reading. The school goal for the 2012-2013 schools year is to increase the percent of proficient students to 33%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

District Results 28% (18507).

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 responses show deficiencies in reading skills, specifically the area of vocabulary	The following instructional strategies will be used: • Vocabulary Word Maps • Context Clues • Reading from a Variety of Texts	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed. In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented.	Formative: Reading Plus Quarterly and Interim Assessments Summative: End-of-the-Year CELLA Assessment. Results of the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

	The 2012 District results of the CELLA Test indicate that

	3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	27% of students who were tested were proficient in the area of writing. The school goal for the 2012-2013 schools year is to increase the percent of proficient students to 32%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

District Results 27% (18338

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 responses show deficiencies in writing skills, specifically the area of organization.	Use of graphic organizers and process writing.	The Literacy Leadership Team along with the Administration will be responsible for monitoring of the implementation of the identified strategies.	Results of quarterly assessments will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed. In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented.	Formative: Quarterly Assessments Summative: End-of-the-Year CELLA Assessment.

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:		

		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students achieving proficiency. Thirty-six percent of the Algebra 1 students in the District scored a 3. Our school goal is for 39% of our Algebra 1 students to score a 3 on the Algebra 1 EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 36% (9310)	School 39% (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	The lowest scoring section in the 2012 EOC Algebra was polynomials with only 35% of the questions answered correctly	Integrate interactive manipulatives and online supplemental resources to increase the understanding of polynomials. Target polynomial instruction in class, during tutoring, and Saturday tutoring	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students scoring at or above Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. Twenty-one percent of the Algebra 1 students in the District scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5. Our school goal is for 22% of our Algebra 1 students to score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the Algebra 1 EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 21%	School 22%

(5366) | (15)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>As evident from the district data, students answered 45% of the questions on functions, linear equations, and inequalities correctly on the 2012 Algebra EOC.</td><td>Provide students opportunities to focus on inquiry activities to increase their understanding of real-world use of equation and inequalities. Provide teachers with training in helping students make sense of problems.</td><td>Principal</td><td>Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.</td><td>Baseline and Interim Assessments

Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam</td></tr>
</table>

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. District results are shown, since this is the school's first year.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57	61	65	69	73	

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:	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	Reduce achievement gap by 50% during established time period.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Students not having adequate technological resources at home</td><td>Provide each student with a laptop to use for school related lessons and activities.</td><td>Principal</td><td>Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.</td><td>Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments.

Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam</td></tr>
</table>

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:

	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	Reduce the achievement gap by 50%.

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 having adequate technological resources at home.	Provide each student with a laptop to use for school related lessons and activities.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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:	
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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	As a new school, our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students scoring at or above a level 3 in Algebra and decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress on the Algebra 1 EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	Reduce achievement gap each year to 50% in 6 years.

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 having adequate technological resources at home	Provide each student with a laptop to use for school related lessons and activities.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students achieving proficiency. Twenty-eight percent of the Geometry students in the District scored a 3. Our school goal is for 32% of our Geometry students to score in the middle third on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 28% (7815)	School 32% (21)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The lowest scoring section was Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics on the 2012 Geometry EOC Exam..	Use software specific to helping students investigate and explore geometric concepts. Students will use software to visualize and explore mathematical concepts that will enable them to improve their math skills in trigonometry and discrete mathematics.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam
2	The lowest scoring section was Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics on the 2012 Geometry EOC Exam.	Develop Professional learning communities (PLC) with vertical and horizontal alignment across the feeder pattern school. Develop the opportunity to participate in a lesson study to observe other teachers explain concepts in trigonometry and discrete mathematics.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students scoring at or above Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry EOC. Twenty-seven percent of the Geometry students in the District scored in the upper third. Our school goal is for 29% of our Geometry students to score in the upper third on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 27% (7522)	School 29% (19)

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 lowest scoring section was Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics on the 2012 Geometry EOC Exam..	Develop Professional learning communities (PLC) with vertical and horizontal alignment across the feeder pattern school. Develop the opportunity to participate in a lesson study to observe other teachers explain concepts in trigonometry and discrete mathematics.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam
2	The lowest scoring section was Trigonometry and Discrete Mathematics on the 2012 Geometry EOC Exam.	Provide students with enrichment activities to foster concepts of discrete mathematics and trigonometr	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments.

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 3A :

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61	65	69	73	

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

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

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	As a new school, our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students scoring at or above a level 3 in Geometry and decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	Reduce the achievement gap by 50% in six years.

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 having adequate technological resources at home	Provide each student with a laptop to use for school related lessons and activities.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	As a new school, our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the district in the percentage of students scoring at or above a level 3 in Geometry and decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress on the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	Reduce the achievement gap by 50% in 6 years.

	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 having adequate technological resources at home.	Provide each student with a laptop to use for school related lessons and activities.	Principal	Review interim data to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed..	Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results of the 2013 End of Course Exam

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
Review and familiarize with the Common Core Standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Discuss the necessary strategies to implement	9th/Algebra 1	PLC Team	9th Grade	Early Release Dates	Implementation in lesson plans.	Principal
Review Interim Data	9th/Algebra 1	PLC Team	School Wide	Early Release Dates	Implementation in lesson plans	Principal
Lesson study to discuss vertical and horizontal alignment of the standards	9th/Algebra 1	PLC Team	School Wide	Early Release Dates	Implementation in lesson plans.	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	Ready to Go On? Intervention and Enrichment with Answers Focus on SSS: Benchmark Tests for Algebra 1 EOC Exam with Answers Focus on SSS: Intervention for Algebra 1 EOC Exam with Answers Classroom Manipulatives Kit Teacher Manipulatives Kit	Funding for Resources on left: FTE	$1,100.00
			Subtotal: $1,100.00
			Grand Total: $1,100.00

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:	As a new school, we will use the District's Biology EOC data to determine our biology school goals. District results show that 30% of biology students scored in the middle third. Our 2013 biology school goal is for 32% of biology students to score in the middle third
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 30% (7646)	School 32% (21)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited lab facilities to conduct experiments.	Buy classroom experiment kits to facilitate lab work in limited facilities. Use of science demonstrations to illustrate concepts. Use of Gizmos (online simulations) as shown on students laptops and Promethean board.	Principal	Teachers will incorporate lab activities into weekly lessons, as evidenced in their plans. Daily walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor compliance.	Formative: Data from Interim Assessment, classroom-developed assessment tools. Summative: End-of-Course Results
	Lack of familiarity with new exam	Professional Development for teachers.	Principal	Teachers will include training on EOC in Professional	Formative: Data from Interim Assessment,

2		Resources for Exam Prep for students.		Development Plan.	classroom-developed assessment tools. Summative: End-of-Course Results
3	Only 43% of Molecular and Cellular Biology Questions were answered correctly on the 2012 EOC.	Instruction in all high school courses adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides. Target deficient areas as shown in lesson plan and Saturday tutoring.	Principal	Monitor progress through interim assessment data and classroom walkthroughs	Formative: Data from Interim Assessment, classroom-developed assessment tools. Summative: End-of-Course Results

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:	As a new school, our goal is to surpass the District in the percentage of students scoring in the upper third.. District data indicate that 29% of biology students scored in the upper third in the 2012 Biology EOC. Our 2013 school goal is for 30% of our biology students to score in the upper third in the 2013 Biology EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 29% (7486)	School 30% (20)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Only 43% of Molecular and Cellular Biology Questions were answered correctly on the 2012 EOC.	Provide inquiry-based and technology-enhanced learning.	Principal	Teachers will include training on areas listed under strategy and EOC in Professional Development Plan	Formative: Data from Interim Assessment, classroom-developed assessment tools. Summative: End-of-Course 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

End-of-Course Exam Training	Biology	Lead Teacher	Biology Teacher	Early Release Dates	Review of Interim Data	Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lab-based coursework	Classroom Lab Kits	FTE	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of online simulations	Promethean Board	FTE	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
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 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:	Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to surpass the District in the percentage of students achieving proficiency (scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.(This year, the school only consists of a 9th grade class who doesn't take the FCAT Writing Assessment until their 10th grade year).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
District 80% (61739)	School 82% (55)

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 focus in their writing.	Develop a pre-writing plan to develop the main idea(s) and supporting details. Assist students to organize their ideas into a logical sequence. Model effective writing	Principal	Results of the Baseline Testing and interim testing will be reviewed to ensure that progress is being made and to make adjustments to instruction as needed.	Rubric-based FCAT class writing assessments and the results of the 2013-2014 FCAT Writing Assessment

| | | using anchor papers. | | In addition, administrative walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that the strategies are being implemented | |
| 2 | Students are limited in their use of word choice for effective communication. | Use mentor text and anchor papers as springboards for creative, effective writing and as a means to understand and apply figurative language, voice, word connotations and denotations, and word choice | Principal | Teachers will include strategies in lesson plan.

Principal will monitor implementation of strategies | Rubric-based FCAT class writing assessments and the results of the 2013-2014 FCAT Writing Assessment |

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
Writing in the content areas	All Subjects	Lead Teacher	School-wide	Early Release Dates	Student results on FCAT-style prompts.	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of writing skills for effective communication	Epic Learning LLC Language Arts, Writing, Communication Skills Series	FTE	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Our attendance goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to surpass the District's average daily attendance rate.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
District 93.69% (345800)	School 94.69% (63.43)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
District 11290	School 3% (2)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
District 85606	School 3% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents are not familiar with the school's attendance policy and the consequences for violating the policy.	Send attendance policy home for parents to sign . Invite parents to a parent workshop where the attendance policy will be explained.	Principal	Weekly progress updates to faculty and staff.	Daily Attendance Reports
2	Lack of incentives for perfect attendance	Announce homerooms with perfect attendance daily. Recognize students at quarterly awards ceremony.	Principal	Regular progress updates to faculty and staff.	Daily attendance reports.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide incentives for students to meet goals.	Incentives	EESAC Funds	$325.00
			Subtotal: $325.00
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: $325.00

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 2012-2013 goal is for our school suspension average to be less than the District's.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
District 41430	School 9
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
District 23562	School 3
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
District 36701	School 8
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
District 21850	School 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	Students and parents are not familiar with the Code of Student Conduct and consequences for violations	Hold parent and student seminars reviewing the Code of Student Conduct and other school procedures.	Principal	Monitor the number of suspensions on a monthly basis.	Monthly suspension reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	Our 2012-2013 school goal is to average less dropouts than the District. As a new school, our high school graduation goal for 2016 (our first graduation) is a graduation rate of at least 80 %.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
NA.	NA.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
District 71.3%	District 73.3% School 80%

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 and students are not aware of graduation requirements.	Provide parent meetings to inform both parents and students of the requirements for graduation as well as resources available to ensure students receive the proper support.	Principal	Review student records to target possible dropouts and provide intervention.	Number of students completing graduation requirements for each grade level.
2	Students fall behind and may feel discouraged if they fail a course in a 6-period day.	Monitor student graduation requirements on a quarterly basis. Offer students a 7 period day to earn additional credits each year and make-up credits if needed.	Principal	Review student records to target possible dropouts and provide intervention.	Number of students completing graduation requirements for each grade level.

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	The school goal is for 100 percent of student families to complete the service-hours requirement.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
This is our first year. No previous data available.	100% Completion

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 time for parents to participate in school activities due to other responsibilities.	Provide diverse opportunities to meet service-hours requirement throughout the school year and at different times of the day.	Principal	At the end of each grading period, parents will receive a progress report of the hours completed.	Percent of families who completed hours by the end of the school year.

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
Opportunities to participate in your child's education	All Subjects	Principal	School-wide	Saturday Academy	Monitoring of service-hours completion	Principal

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of parental involvement incentives	Participation incentives: school supplies.	EESAC allocation	$325.00
			Subtotal: $325.00
			Grand Total: $325.00

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:	Our 2012-2013 STEM school goal is to increase enrollment in honors courses and have all students complete an interdisciplinary project.
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
	Students lack organizational skills to work on projects	Plan and implement project-based lessons to develop	Principal	Monthly meetings will be conducted to discuss the progress in	Enrollment in honors courses and the results of

1	effectively.	organizational skills in students.		students' development of organizational skills and track teacher progress towards completion of advanced course requirements.	the SECME competition
2	Limited offerings of advanced courses due to lack of teachers for advanced courses.	Provide professional development so that teachers develop the skills to successfully develop advanced lessons.	Principal	Monthly meetings will be conducted to discuss the progress in students' development of organizational skills and track teacher progress towards completion of advanced course requirements.	Enrollment in honors courses and the results of the SECME competition

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
Train teachers on the SECME components and how to use STEM practices to cultivate higher order thinking	High School	Science Teacher	School-wide	November 6	Walkthrough Observations Feedback at Faculty Meetings IPEGS Evaluations	Principal

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:	Our 2012-2013 school goal is to develop a program for students to complete requirements for career or industry certification in the areas of Health Science and New Media.

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	Limited course offerings in the area of CTE.	Teach students the requirements and benefits of being part of a career/technology academy.	Principal	Periodic reviews of career/technical program development.	Completion of career/technical program and enrollment numbers in academies for the 2013-2014 school year.

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)

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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Project-based Learning and Thematic Units. Development of Reading Skills	SpringBoard Curriculum Jamestown	FTE FTE	$1,525.00
Science	Lab-based coursework	Classroom Lab Kits	FTE	$1,000.00
Attendance	Provide incentives for students to meet goals.	Incentives	EESAC Funds	$325.00
				Subtotal: $2,850.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Development of Reading Skills	Reading Plus	FTE	$1,200.00
Science	Use of online simulations	Promethean Board	FTE	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $3,200.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Development of Reading Skills Project-based Learning and Thematic Units	Training on Reading Plus SpringBoard Curriculum	FTE FTE	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reinforcement of Concepts. Drill & Practice. Test-taking Skills.	Saturday Academy	Grant	$2,000.00
Mathematics		Ready to Go On? Intervention and Enrichment with Answers Focus on SSS: Benchmark Tests for Algebra 1 EOC Exam with Answers Focus on SSS: Intervention for Algebra 1 EOC Exam with Answers Classroom Manipulatives Kit Teacher Manipulatives Kit	Funding for Resources on left: FTE	$1,100.00
Writing	Use of writing skills for effective communication	Epic Learning LLC Language Arts, Writing, Communication Skills Series	FTE	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Use of parental involvement incentives	Participation incentives: school supplies.	EESAC allocation	$325.00
				Subtotal: $4,425.00
				Grand Total: $11,475.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA	

Are you a reward school: jn Yes   jn No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
To provide SAC meeting attendance incentives.	$325.00

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

The main purpose of the SAC is to monitor school improvement. To do so, there is continuous data analysis and discussion of the best ways to target student needs and achieve the school goals.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found