FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH

District Name: Broward

Principal: B. Montero

SAC Chair: Y. Imperatori

Superintendent: Donnie Carter

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 8/31/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Bernardo Montero	B.S. in History with a Latin American Studies Minor M.S. in Educational Leadership	9	11	2011-2012 Somerset Academy High School Grade: Pending Reading Mastery: Lowest 25% in Reading: Math Mastery: Lowest 25% in Math: Science Mastery: Writing Mastery: AYP:
Assis Principal	Walkiria Soberon	B.A. in English Literature M.S. in Educational Leadership	4	5	2011-2012 Somerset Academy High School Grade: Pending Reading Mastery: Lowest 25% in Reading: Math Mastery: Lowest 25% in Math: Science Mastery: Writing Mastery: AYP:
		K-12 Masters in Reading			2011-2012 Somerset Academy High School Grade: Pending

| Assis Principal | Cristina Camus | Certified Language Arts 6-12

Specialist in Educational Leadership | 10 | 1 | Reading Mastery:
Lowest 25% in Reading:
Math Mastery:
Lowest 25% in Math:
Science Mastery:
Writing Mastery:
AYP: No |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Sarah Fye	Certified in Language Arts 6-12	3	1	2011-2012 Somerset Academy High School Grade: Pending Reading Mastery: Lowest 25% in Reading: Math Mastery: Lowest 25% in Math: Science Mastery: Writing Mastery: AYP:
Math	Rachel Notowitz	Certified in Math 6-9; Science 6-9	6		2011-2012 Somerset Academy Middle School Grade: Pending Reading Mastery: Lowest 25% in Reading: Math Mastery: Lowest 25% in Math: Science Mastery: Writing Mastery: AYP:

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Teachers-Teachers.com web-site to advertise openings	Administration	Ongoing	
2	Teacher Mentoring Program	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, NESS coordinator, and Leadership Team/Department Chairs	Ongoing	
3	Professional Development	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach and Leadership Team/Department Chairs	Ongoing	
4	Leadership Opportunities	Administration	Ongoing	
5	Tuition reimbursement	Principal	Ongoing	
6	Teacher of the month/year recognition ceremonies	Administration	Ongoing	
7	Team Building Activities	Leadership Team	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an

effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

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
36	19.4%(7)	36.1%(13)	36.1%(13)	2.8%(1)	33.3%(12)	83.3%(30)	5.6%(2)	0.0%(0)	2.8%(1)

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
Fye, Sarah	Cedeno, Laci	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Acevedo, Lisa	Bruns, Amy	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Delgado, Vielka	Bello, Barbara	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Oliver, Corey	Sinquefield, Deloris	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Amendola, Michael	Taylor, Jared	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Beckenhauer, April	Oporta, Christopher	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Cavanaugh, Lauren	McMillan, Patrick	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC
Venkat, Jaishri	Carrasco, Monica	Subject Area and Experience	Informal observations, walkthroughs, PGP, data chats, clinical educator strategies, PLC

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal:
Provides a common vision for the use of data-driven decision-making. Communicates with parents and staff about the early intervention programs. Ensures implementation of RtI model.
Curriculum Leadership Team:

Participates in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; and maintains communication with department members for input and feedback. Develops intervention strategies for struggling students.
Exceptional Student Education Teacher (ESE):
Participates in student data collection; provides information and data about core instruction; maintains communication with general education teacher; and collaborates with teachers, counselors, and school psychologist.
Counselor:
Monitors student achievement; set-up parent-teacher conferences; develops academic contracts; and communicates with stakeholders.

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

The Leadership Team will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies.
The Team will meet on a bi-weekly basis to engage in the following activities:
Monitor progress of low level achievers in math, science, reading and writing.
Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan across the curriculum.
Develop and monitor a tutoring program that suits the needs of our struggling students.
Use data from in-house interim assessments as well as BEEP's (county) mini-assessments and BAT to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in reading, science, math and writing.
Review and monitor progress of all students using FCAT Explorer, My Access, JRN, Focus and Carnegie as a supplementary program to the curriculum.
Ensure that all teachers are teaching reading strategies across the curriculum.
Adhere to Instructional Focus Calendars provided by the County.

How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts?
All of our school teams meet periodically to frequently monitor programs in place and make informed decisions about changes in the strategic interventions being provided. The information gathered allows for the RTI team to make decisions regarding tier-to-tier placements and to provide oversight of procedures and fidelity of implementation.

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

The Leadership Team will provide levels of support, intervention, and creative methods of instructional delivery consistent and prevalent within thematic units and concepts. Data gathered from formative and summative assessments will be used for the purposes of decision making to target the weaknesses of our students. The Leadership Team will also monitor the fidelity of instructional delivery and intervention in order to alter and develop a more in depth school improvement plan year after year.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data:
Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), School-Wide Diagnostic Assessment, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), My Access Writing Pre-Test, Princeton Review SAT Pre-Test, PSAT – 10th Grade
Progress Monitoring:
Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Mini-Assessments
Midyear:
Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), My Access Writing Mid Year Assessment
End of Year:
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), SAT, EOC's
Frequency of Data Days:
Once a quarter for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during first week of school. Small sessions are planned throughout the year. Professional development sessions entitled "What is RtI?" and "How can we meet the challenges of implementing data-driven instruction?" will be infused into on an ongoing basis into the professional development calendar.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

In order to support our multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) so that we can continue to provide high quality instruction and intervention we need to have teams meet on a bi-weekly basis through individual departments as well as come together as a leadership team. In short, these meetings are meant to assist in identifying what problem is inflicting our school at the current time and find a resolution for it. This can simply be done by identifying the problem, analyzing why it is occurring, implementing a plan of action, and finally evaluating how effective the original solution was in order to improve it for the upcoming school year. This is a key component to our Schools Continuous Improvement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

* Walkiria Soberon, Vice Principal
* Jennifer Diaz de Villegas, Guidance Counselor
* April Beckenhauer, Art Teacher
* Vielka Delgado, Math Teacher
* Lisa Piterski, Science Teacher
* Sarah Fye, Reading Coach
* Greg Notowitz, Social Science Teacher
* Miriela Vazquez, Language Arts Teacher
* Diana Santangelo, Foreign Language Teacher

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

Much like the RTI Team, the LLT will focus its meetings around questions pertaining to the implementation of instruction and intervention strategies. The Team will meet on a monthly basis to engage in the following activities:
Monitor progress of low level achievers in reading and writing.
Monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan across the curriculum.
Develop and monitor a tutoring program that suits the needs of our struggling students.
Use data from in-house interim assessments as well as BEEP's (county) mini-assessments and BAT to determine mastery of benchmarks for all students in reading, science, math and writing in order to decipher if the programs in place are working for our students.
Ensure that all teachers are teaching reading strategies across the curriculum.
Adhere to Instructional Focus Calendars provided by the County.

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

Based on research on student achievement and school data, in alignment with the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and in light of the advent of the implementation of the Common Core Standards, the team will oversee the implementation of the revised school reading plan, which focuses on a major area of weakness in our students, vocabulary.

The team will focus on composing needs assessments of its teachers and providing professional development opportunities in accordance with meeting those needs.

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.

*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?

The school offers elective courses in art, technology, and career study. Many of these courses focus on job skills and talent development. Teachers also incorporate current events and reading passages that relate to concepts which allow students to create a connection between subject matter and daily lives.

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?

Course selections are sent home for students to review with their parent. Then, students are scheduled to meet one-on-one with the counselors. At these meetings students' FCAT scores, interests, academic grades, and major of interest (ePEP) are reviewed to better meet student needs and interests.

Postsecondary Transition

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

In order to increase student's readiness for postsecondary level, we have implemented several programs within our school such as a plethora in Advanced Placement classes, Dual Enrollment, SAT prep course, Pre-Law, and Pre-Med Academy. We are stressing the importance of taking the ACT and/or SAT before the end of the student's junior year of high school so that they have baseline scores in which they can compare their progress to. In addition to having all students take the SAT by the time they are Juniors, we are offering a summer and after school program in junction with Princeton Review that will provide students with preparation for both ACT and SAT.

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:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that 24% of students in grade ninth through tenth achieved a level 3 in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving at least a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (104) out of 431 students tested obtained a 3.	68% (329) out of 485 students will obtain at least a 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Moving part of the lowest 25% from a level 1 or 2 into a level 3	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars which will be provided to the reading teachers	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. Quick Study program Test Ready will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FORF Measurement; MAZE Measure; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	FORF Measurement; MAZE Measure; Simulated FCATreading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum

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:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that 39% of students in grade ninth through tenth achieved a level 4 or 5 in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading by 5%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (169) out of 431 students tested obtained a 4 or 5	50% (242) out of 485 students will obtain a 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Moving students from a level of proficiency to a level of mastery to have a growth of 54% from 27% level 4 or 5 in reading.	Enroll students in advanced classes focusing of FCAT and SAT strategies with highly qualified instructors. Provide specific reading enrichment and administer mock FCAT/SAT exams in order to measure growth and determine instructional adjustment. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars which will be provided to all teachers Train content area teachers in NGCAR-PD to ensure a level of rigor across the curriculum that is consistent with the Common Core Standards. Enroll students in classes with	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators, content area teachers and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. FCAT Test maker; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2010 FCAT. FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS	Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum. PSAT and SAT assessments; Princeton Review SAT tutoring sessions.

		teachers who are reading endorsed.		strategies; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	

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:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that 68% of students in grade ninth through tenth made gains in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (279) out of 410 students made learning gains	73% (312) out of 433 students will make learning gains

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
	Getting the lowest 25% to meet proficiency in reading	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Have students attend Saturday school in order to reinforce strategies taught within the school week. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT	FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating

| 1 | | resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars which will be provided to the reading teachers | | Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. Quick Study program Test Ready will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum. | reading strategies across the curriculum |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that 58% of our lowest 25% in grade ninth through tenth made gains in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (71) out of 106 students in lowest 25% made learning gains	72% (80) out of 111 students in lowest 25% will make learning gains

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	Making the bulk of the lowest 25% proficient	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from FAIR. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars which will be provided to the reading teachers	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. FCAT TES maker will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FORF Measurement; MAZE Measure; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	FAIR; Simulated FCATreading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum

---

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #
	5A : After analyzing data from previous years, there has been a steady growth from year to year. Starting at 59% in 2010-2011, it is our goal to go up to 84% by the time we get to 2016-2017.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that we have a high % of our student subgroups population not meeting satisfactory progress in reading within grades ninth through tenth are proficient in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) making adequate yearly progress (AYP) on the 2012 FCAT Reading by at least 12% in each category.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 30% (23) out of 76 Black 37% (34) out of 91 Hispanic 40% (96) out of 239	White 76% (66) out of 87 Black 66% (62) out of 94 Hispanic 64% (159) out of 249

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	Decrease the number students reading below grade level.	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars which will be provided to the reading teachers	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. FCAT Test maker will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FORF Measurement; MAZE Measure; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that we have a high % of our student subgroups population not meeting satisfactory progress in reading within grades ninth through tenth are proficient in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) making adequate yearly progress (AYP) on the 2012 FCAT Reading by at least 12% in each category.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (8) out of 10 students were reading at or above grade level	90% (9) out of 10 students will read at or above grade level
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
	Making all subgroups proficient in Reading	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will	FAIR; Simulated FCATreading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data;

	Strategy (cont.)	Person/Position	Process (cont.)	Evaluation Tool (cont.)
1	classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars will be provided to the reading teachers	and Curriculum Specialist.	be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. FCAT Test maker will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicates that we have a high % of our student subgroups population not meeting satisfactory progress in reading within grades ninth through tenth are proficient in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) making adequate yearly progress (AYP) on the 2012 FCAT Reading by at least 12% in each category.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (12) out of 19 students were reading at or above grade level	68% (13) out of 19 students will read at or above grade level

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
	Making all subgroups proficient in Reading	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a	FAIR; Simulated FCATreading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the

1		from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars will be provided to the reading teachers		weekly basis. FCAT Test maker will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	curriculum

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:	An analysis of the 2011 FCAT Reading test indicates that 57% of our student subgroups in grade ninth through tenth are proficient in Reading. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) making adequate yearly progress (AYP) on the 2012 FCAT Reading by at least 12%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (68) out of 137 students were reading at or above grade level	62% (151) out of 243 students will read at or above grade level

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	Making more that 62% of all subgroups proficient in reading	Enroll students in a reading intervention course with highly qualified instructors that have taught intensive classes. Provide specific reading interventions, such as pull outs by the Reading Coach who will administer differentiated time and resources to the students. Provide ongoing process monitoring using a variety of measures to determine instructional adjustment. The assessment data from Florida Oral Reading Fluency and the Maze. Reading comprehension and vocabulary strategies will be integrated in all Intensive courses. Rubrics, graphic organizers and meta-cognitive strategies will be addressed on the Instructional Focus Calendars will be provided to the reading teachers	Language Arts Teachers, Department Heads, Administrators and Curriculum Specialist.	Students will continuously be monitored for improvement and proficiency; students will be given monthly benchmark assessment testing to measure progress. As part of the instructional strategies, students and parents are given periodic updates of progress made through our Pinnacle Parent Portal. In addition, FCAT Explorer will be evaluated by the teacher on a weekly basis. FCAT Test Maker will be used to assess comprehension and mechanic skills; Summative evaluation will be conducted as part of the 2011 FCAT. FAIR; Simulated FCAT reading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; Accelerated Reading Software;	FAIR; Simulated FCATreading performance items; Benchmark Assessment Data; and 2010-2011 FCAT Assessment; CRISS strategies; FCAT Explorer Accelerated Reading Software; Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum

					Provided and model professional development on incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum.	

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
Building Assessments and student motivation	All	Curriculum Specialist	School-wide	March-April	Observations and presence in lesson plans	Administration; Curriculum and reading specialist

---

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	Springboard	Operational	$30,000.00
		Subtotal:	$30,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	My Access	Operational	$20,000.00
		Subtotal:	$20,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	NGCAR-PD	Operational	$24,000.00
		Subtotal:	$24,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	SAT School	Oerational	$35,000.00
		Subtotal:	$35,000.00
		Grand Total:	$109,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal #1:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	
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 Algebra. Algebra 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 Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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 Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$0.00

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. 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:	An analysis of the 2011 FCAT Science test indicates that 30% of students in eleventh grade achieved a level 3. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving at least a level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (43) out of 143 students tested obtained a 3	35% (54) out of 153 students will obtain a 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The anticipated barrier is having the kids show growth within all levels.	1. Administer diagnostic pre and post-test to evaluate learning gains. 2. Teachers will assess the student's achievement of higher cognitive skills that are in coordination to the Sunshine State Standards. 3. Publisher and teacher created quizzes and tests to monitor progress. 4. 2011 Science Fcat will be disaggregated by the administration and Leadership Council members to determine effectiveness.	Teachers and Administration	1. Analyzing data generated from pre and post-tests 2. Differentiated instruction, Provide continual training on the 8-Step Continuous Improvement Model, Provide training to all teachers in Creating Independence through student –owned Strategies (CRISS) , New teachers will receive continuous mentoring throughout their first year of teaching; Online staff development courses sponsored by Broward County Public Schools	1. 8-Step Continuous Improvement Model Prentice Hall - Life Science 2.Glencoe/Pearson integrated science textbooks 3.Prentice Hall Modern Earth Science

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:	
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						

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 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 | An analysis of the 2012 FCAT Writing test indicates that |

3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:			94% of students in tenth grade achieved a level 3 or above. Our current goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving at least a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Writing by 3%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
94% (193) out of 205 students tested obtained a 3 or above			97% (228) out of 236 students tested will obtain a 3 or more		

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	Continue to improve our students writing	1. Incorporate CRISS and writing throughout content areas including strategies specific to each Subgroup. 2. Use 6+1 Writing Method 3. Provide coaching and mentoring in monthly writing prompts, interpretation of the U-6 Scoring Rubric, analysis of student papers, and specific strategies to guide instruction to ensure writing gains and showing the students what a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6 essay looks like. 4. Incorporate the use of My Access within the 8th, 10th, and 12th grade curriculum. 5. Incorporated the use of grammar for writing workbooks to improve syntax and clarity in writing.	Administration and Teachers	1. Teachers are offered CRISS training provided by a Broward County certified instructor. 2. Professional Development workshops will be given explain the 6+1 writing method 3. Professional Development workshops will also be given by our reading coach to explain specific strategies to be implemented in the classroom.	1. Provide weekly assessment using District prompts to monitor students' progress. 2. Writing as a communication skill will be emphasized throughout the school year. 3. Conduct monthly writing assessment through language arts classes in all grades.

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
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Somerset Academy will increase the attendance rate by 1%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96%	97%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
12%	11%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
11%	10%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The students and getting parental support	Advertise the importance of attendance to all stakeholders by parent link and on the marquee. Meet with the attendance committee on a quarterly basis so that we can go over and meet with individual offenders.	Attendance Committee	Weekly committee meeting and report analysis	Terms, School Check in, Data analysis

---

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our suspension amounts for the year 2010-2011 will decrease by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
36%	31%
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
36%	31%
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
6%	2%
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
6%	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	Teachers not reporting or following the progressive discipline plan	Closely monitoring referrals and discipline issues. Detentions and Saturday detentions will be issued.	Administration, Disciplinarian	Quarterly reviews discipline data	Suspension records

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)

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.*	Based on past Climate surveys of school based events there is a high level of parental involvement in social programs. However, there needs to be more emphasis placed on effective communication between the school and the parents.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
70%	73%

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	Effective communication and use of parent portal	Advertise events on parent link and on the marquee. School Notes will be updated weekly.	Administration, Leadership Counsel, Teachers, PTSO	Research studies show that consistent involvement by parents and other influential stakeholders is an essential element in education.	An increased participation will be self evident at school activities and functions. The school's climate survey will be used to evaluate interventions, parental opinions and Perceptions. 80% of parents

					will access the parent portal.
2	Increase attendance in parent academies and conferences.	Advertise parent universities about academic programs on marquee, word of mouth, through parent link, and school notes.	Administration, Leadership Counsel, Teachers, PTSO	Research studies show that consistent involvement by parents and other influential stakeholders is an essential element in education.	An increased participation will be self evident at school activities and functions. The school's climate survey will be used to evaluate interventions, parental opinions and Perceptions. The school will increase the number of parent/teacher contacts by 10% by June 2011.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading		Springboard	Operational	$30,000.00
				Subtotal: $30,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading		My Access	Operational	$20,000.00
				Subtotal: $20,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading		NGCAR-PD	Operational	$24,000.00
				Subtotal: $24,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading		SAT School	Oerational	$35,000.00
				Subtotal: $35,000.00
				Grand Total: $109,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ȷ⌐ Priority	ȷ⌐ Focus	ȷ⌐ Prevent	ȷ⌐ NA

Are you a reward school: ȷ⌐ Yes ȷ⌐ 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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	59%	86%	80%	41%	266	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	60%	80%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	68% (YES)			126	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					532	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
SOMERSET ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	57%	85%	91%	34%	267	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	60%	78%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	75% (YES)			141	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					556	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested