

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: HUDSON HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Pasco

Principal: David LaRoche, Ph.D.

SAC Chair: TBA

Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 8/29/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	David LaRoche, Ph.D.	Social Studies 6-12, Florida School Principal	8	12	2007 - C 2008 - C 2009 - D 2010 - D 2011 - B 2012 - TBD
Assis Principal	E. Michelle Williams	Math 6-12, Educational Leadership	5	5	2007 - C 2008 - C 2009 - D 2010 - D 2011 - B 2012 - TBD
Assis Principal	Charlene Prahasky	Math 6-12, Language Arts 6-12, SLD 6-12, Reading Endorsement, Educational Leadership	3	3	2010 - D 2011 - B 2012 - TBD
Assis Principal	Jessica Meek	Elem Ed Ed Leadership Reading Endorsement	2	2	2010 - D 2011 - B 2012- - TBD

Assis Principal	Toni Zetzsche	Elem Ed, Middle Grades Integrated, Exceptional Student Education, Educational Leadership	2		First Year Administrator
-----------------	---------------	--	---	--	--------------------------

### 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)
K-12 Literacy Coach	Melinda Bulp			3	

### 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	Professional Learning Communities	Dave LaRoche	June 2013	
2	Embedded Professional Development	Charlene Prahasky	June 2013	
3	Teacher Induction Program	Content Area Mentors/Jessica Meek	June 2013	
4	Staff Recognition Program	Toni Zetzsche	June 2013	

### 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
74	2.7%(2)	23.0%(17)	55.4%(41)	18.9%(14)	14.9%(11)	0.0%(0)	12.2%(9)	0.0%(0)	17.6%(13)

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Laurayne Dola Allison Poindexter Steven Casel Julia Kamleiter	Beth Hess Gary Enoch Russell Vachon Michael Lewis	Reading/LA LA Social Studies Foreign Languages	Weekly Meetings

## 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.

Shannon Murphy - Behavior Specialist  
Victoria Vetter - Behavior Specialist  
Michelle Basu - Guidance Counselor  
Sharon Moltzan - Social Worker  
Julie Yusko - Staffing and Compliance Teacher  
Teresa Caraker - GEP Teacher  
Keith Newton - GEP Teacher  
Doreen Grote - GEP Teacher  
Roberta Marsh - Career Specialist  
Melinda Bupb - Literacy Specialist

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?

- Review of Universal Screening data.
- Review of Progress Monitoring data.
- Planning for Interventions.
- Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)).
- Assessment of school staff's practices and skill development (RtI Skills and RtI Perception of Practices Surveys).
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation.

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

- Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation.
- Identification of critical RtI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity.
- Analysis of school wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends.
- Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention.
- Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment).
- Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars.
- Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity
- Review of Progress Monitoring data.
- Planning for Interventions.
- Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self- Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)).
- Assessment of school staff's skill development (RtI Skills Survey).
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation.

### 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.

FAIR for progress monitoring. Also, eSembler, STAR, PMRN, and TERMS.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Hudson High School will participate in a 2 day professional development training that will focus on the following:

- Description of data collection processes to assess current staff skills.
- Identification of days available for RtI professional development.
- Content of professional development days based on state model professional development plan
- Resources to conduct professional development
- Resources to provide technical assistance and follow-up/support
- Plan for data collection to evaluate RtI implementation levels (e.g., SAPSI).
- Ensure plan includes action steps for the development of absent or partially present RtI infrastructure components

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Shannon Casel  
Steven Casel  
Dalne Laurayne Dola  
Julia Kamleiter  
Allison Poindexter  
Anthony Fontanella  
Leslie Vachon  
Jennifer Gutauskas  
Michele Basu  
Julie Heise  
Teresa Caraker  
Jayme Holihan  
Melissa Caruso  
Lynn Turner  
Kathryn Ward  
Roberta Marsh

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

The School Improvement Team meets on the first Wednesday of each month. The role of this team is to monitor the school improvement plan throughout the year.

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

- \* Implementing and monitoring the school improvement goals
- \* Data driven instruction and how to use data to differentiate instruction
- \* School-wide teacher-student mentoring program
- \* Increasing the graduation rate
- \* Decreasing the number of referrals
- \* Increase student engagement school-wide through the implementation of gradual release model
- \* Increase classroom rigor

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

The school-wide implementation of the Gradual Release Model of instruction and Cognitive Complexity requires the implementation of reading strategies during each phase of lesson implementation. Strategies utilized across the content areas include Think Alouds, Selective Highlighting, Two Column Notes, THIEVES, Read Alouds, etc. Evidence of reading strategies and the utilization of levels of complexity, in both activities and questioning, will be monitored through lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

The English IV course that we have developed should improve student readiness for post-secondary work by providing reading and writing applications that establish relevance to students' futures. Also, our career academies offer courses that apply academics to career-specific content that will be relevant to students' futures. Schools provide academic and career planning that engages students in developing a personally meaningful course of study so they can achieve goals they have set for themselves. In addition, students enrolled in Math for College Readiness receive instruction specific to post secondary readiness.

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

Guidance staff and the Career Specialist meet with the students each year to review their academic history and develop a plan for success. Students also participate in course selection presentations and Curriculum Night to assist in the course selection process. Students then choose courses in a lab setting.

### Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

Community College and University representatives visit Hudson High School regularly. Catalogs and schedules are available to students through the guidance department and the career resource center.

The Career specialist meets with interested students about post-secondary opportunities.

CPT and PERT is offered at Hudson High School annually and is advertised to all parents and students.

A transition plan is in place for graduating ESE students which enables students to explore a variety of post-secondary options.

CTE program offerings include courses leading to certification within career academies.

SAT/ACT tests are offered on campus once per month. Coordinators are on staff.

PLAN/PSAT are offered to all interested students once per year.

Dual Enrollment courses are offered to students both on campus and at the PHCC campus. Student schedules are built to accommodate the inclusion of these courses.

Parent information evenings are offered throughout the year to build awareness in regards to post-secondary readiness including: College/Career Night, PSAT Parent Night, Curriculum Night, Financial Aid Night.

Guidance staff also provides an opportunity for students to participate in an orientation session at Pasco Hernando Community College.

## 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:	To increase student achievement in reading performance at level 3 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the Spring 2012 School Grade Report 47% of students achieved high standards in reading 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 50% of students will achieve high standards in reading.

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Access to technology in preparing students for online testing.	Providing online assessment opportunities for students which mirror state testing requirements.  Use of responders in classroom assessments.  Use of iPad and iTouch devices to assist in increasing the digital experience of students.	Technology Specialist  Technology Specialist/Math Department	Monitoring student participation in online assessments.  Monitoring student participation in the use of responders in the classroom and other digital resources.	Computer Lab schedule.  Schedule of teacher use of classroom responders and other digital resources.
2	Provide opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the FCAT Reading 2.0 format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments incorporating questions formatting the same manner and the test item specifications for the FCAT Reading 2.0 with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/ C. Prahasky  Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments
3	Identify reading intervention needs of all students.	Review current student ability and determine reading intervention.	Charlene Prahasky and Student Achievement Coach for Literacy	Monitor student progress in reading through FAIR	FAIR data
4	Students gaining experience with non-narrative passages that parallel the length and complexity of the reading FCAT.	Administer a common assessment cycle through 9th and 10th grade Language Arts courses that address each category assessed on the FCAT.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of	Charlene Prahasky and Language Arts Instructors.  Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitor student performance on the category assessments.  Administrative Walk-throughs	Category assessment data.  Walk-through document



	Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.		
--	--	--	--

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:	To increase the percentage of students scoring Level 4, 5, or 6 on the 2013 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% of students scored at an achievement level 4, 5, or in reading.	22% of students will score at an achievement level 4, 5, or 6 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the FAA exam format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments in IND classrooms incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the FAA with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Assessments

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% of students scored at an achievement level 4 or higher in reading.	22% of students will score at an achievement level 4 or higher in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate levels of cognitive complexity/rigor present in classroom instruction, assignments and assessments.	Incorporate the Gradual Release Model and appropriate levels of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.  Incorporate appropriate stages of rigor in lesson planning.	Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	administrative walkthroughs  review of lesson plans	walkthrough document  lesson plans
	Students gaining experience with non-	Administer a common assessment cycle	Charlene Prahasky and Language Arts	Monitor student performance on the	Category assessment data

2	narrative passages that parallel the length and complexity of the reading FCAT.	through 9th and 10th grade Language Arts courses that address each category assessed on the FCAT.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.	Instructors  Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	classroom category assessments.  Administrative Walk-throughs	Walk-through document
---	---	--	---	---	-----------------------

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:	To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 on the 2013 FAA in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% of students scored level 7 or above on the FAA.	52% of students will score at or above level 7 on the FAA.

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	Appropriate levels of cognitive complexity/rigor present in classroom instruction, assignments and assessments.	Incorporate the Gradual Release Model and appropriate levels of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.  Incorporate appropriate stages of rigor in lesson planning.	Admin/ PLT team	Administrative Walkthroughs and lesson plans	Assessments and lesson plans

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	To increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% of students made learning gains as measured by the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.	60% of students will make learning gains as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Student readiness for the length and complexity of the FCAT Reading 2.0.	Horizontal planning for standards assessed on FCAT Reading 2.0 through Language Arts	Charlene Prahasky & Language Arts Department Chairs	Monitor student performance on pre and post-test assessments.	Pre and Post-test data  Walk-through

1		and Intensive Reading classes.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.	Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	Administrative Walk-throughs	document
2	Student readiness for the length and complexity of the reading FCAT.	Horizontal planning of FCAT categories through 10th grade Language Arts classes.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.	Charlene Prahasky Language Arts Department Chairs  Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitor student performance on category assessments.  Administrative Walk-throughs	Category assessment data  Walk-through document

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:	To increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% of students made learning gains on the FAA.	38% of students are expected to make learning gains on the FAA.

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:	To increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading as based on the 2013 FCAT data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading.	67% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students in the lowest	Administer a common	Charlene Prahasky,	Monitor student	Pre and Post- test

1	quartile gaining experience with assessments that parallel the length and complexity of the FCAT Reading 2.0.	assessment cycle through 9th and 10th grade Language Arts and Intensive Reading classes assessed on the FCAT Reading 2.0.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.	Language Arts Instructors, and Intensive Reading Instructors.  Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	performance on the pre and post-test assessments.  Administrative Walk-through	assessment data  Walk-through document
2	Students in the lowest quartile gaining experience with assessments that parallel the length and complexity of the reading FCAT.	Administer a common assessment cycle through 9th and 10th grade Language Arts courses that address each category assessed on the FCAT.  Incorporation of Gradual Release Model of instruction and appropriate level of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.	Charlene Prahasky and Language Arts Instructors  Administration and K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitor student performance on the classroom category assessments.  Administrative Walk-through	Category assessment data  Walk-through document

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 # After six school years the percentage of students meeting proficiency standards will be 72.					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	44%	50%	56%	62%	68%	

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:	To increase the percentage of white students achieving AYP on the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not available	_____ of white students will achieve AYP as measured by the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing additional support for struggling students.	After-school tutoring opportunities.  Utilize Extended School Day resources to offer after-school support in the Learning Lab.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by progress reports and report cards.
	Student readiness for the	Develop common	PLT Facilitator	Analyze results of	Common

2	length and level of difficulty of state assessments.	assessments with a focus on the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.	common assessments in Data Teams.	Assessments
---	--	--	-----------------------------------	-------------

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	
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
1	Providing additional support for struggling SWD students.	After school tutoring opportunities. Opportunity to receive additional support in the learning lab.	Toni Zetsche/ESE case managers	Progress of participating students will be monitored by case manager and Admin	Progress reports and report cards.

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:	To increase the percentage of students with disabilities making AYP on the 2013 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not available	_____ of SWD will make AYP as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing additional support for struggling Economically Disadvantaged students.	After school tutoring opportunities. Utilize Extended School Day resources to offer after school support in the Learning Lab.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by progress reports and report cards.
2	Access to after school instructional support.	Transportation through extended school day.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by report cards and progress reports.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making	
--	--

satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	To increase the percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged making AYP on the 2013 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not available	_____ of Economically Disadvantaged students will make AYP as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Cognitive Complexity	9-12	Admin & Literacy Specialist	Instructional staff	Semester 1	PLT weekly meetings	C. Prahasky
Common Core	Language Arts and Mathematics	Admin & Literacy Specialist	Language Arts and Mathematics instructors	Semester 2	PLT weekly meetings Professional Learning Days	C. Prahasky M. Williams

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 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:		To increase the number of students proficient in listening/speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
13/15 students are 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
1	-Language -No/Limited access to resources -No/Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school) -No/Limited opportunities to practice during the day -Out of Field Teachers (not trained)	-Supplemental language learning software usage  -Access to additional language development resources (books, dictionaries, instructional assistant, etc.) -Highly qualified teachers (ESOL certified/endorsed) -Use of best practices in the classroom -Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff -ESOL endorsement course and other trainings for faculty and staff	Admin ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher	-Administrative Walk-throughs -Teacher Evaluations/Observations -Student data from language learning software programs -Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments	-CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) -FCAT (Reading and Writing) -Florida Writes -EOC Exams

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:		To increase the number of students proficient in reading.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
7/15 students are proficient in reading.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	-Language -No/Limited access to resources -No/Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school) -No/Limited opportunities to practice during the day -Out of Field Teachers (not trained)	-Supplemental language learning software usage -Access to additional language development resources (books, dictionaries, instructional assistant, etc.) -Highly qualified teachers (ESOL certified/endorsed) -Use of best practices in the classroom -Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff -ESOL endorsement course and other trainings for faculty and staff	Admin ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher	-Administrative Walk-throughs -Teacher Evaluations/Observations -Student data from language learning software programs -Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments	-CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) -FCAT (Reading and Writing) -Florida Writes -EOC Exams

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	To increase the number of students proficient in writing.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

11/15 students are 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
1	-Language -No/Limited access to resources -No/Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school) -No/Limited opportunities to practice during the day -Out of Field Teachers (not trained)	-Supplemental language learning software usage -Access to additional language development resources (books, dictionaries, instructional assistant, etc.) -Highly qualified teachers (ESOL certified/endorsed) -Use of best practices in the classroom -Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff -ESOL endorsement course and other trainings for faculty and staff	Admin ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher	-Administrative Walk-throughs -Teacher Evaluations/Observations -Student data from language learning software programs -Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments	-CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) -FCAT (Reading and Writing) -Florida Writes -EOC Exams



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:	To increase the number of students scoring level 4 and above on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% of students scored a level 4,5 and 6 on the FAA.	52% of students are expected to score level 4, 5 and 6 on the FAA

### 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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the FAA exam format and level of difficulty.	Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	Admin/PLT Facilitators/Admin	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2:	To increase the number of students scoring at or above level 7 on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% of students scored level 7 or above on the FAA.	37% of students are expected to score level 7 or above on the FAA.

### 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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the FAA exam format and level of difficulty.	Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:		To increase the number of students making learning gains in mathematics on the FAA.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
30%of students made learning gains in mathematics on the FAA.		34% of students are expected to make learning gains on the FAA.			
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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the FAA exam format and level of difficulty.	Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments

## 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:		To increase student performance at proficiency or above on the Algebra 1 EOC exam.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
67% of first time test takers demonstrated proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC exam. 64% of all test takers demonstrated proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC exam.		60% of first time test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC exam. 57% of all test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC exam. (Estimated performance based on no Algebra 1A in 2010-11.			
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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the state EOC exam format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the blueprints for the EOC exams with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin  Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments
	Access to technology in preparing students for online testing.	Providing online assessment opportunities for students which mirror	Technology Specialist	Monitoring student participation in online assessments.	Computer Lab schedule.

2	state testing requirements.  Use of responders in classroom assessments.  Use of iPad and iTouch devices to assist in increasing the digital experience of students.	Technology Specialist/Math Department	Monitoring student participation in the use of responders in the classroom and other digital resources.	Schedule of teacher use of classroom responders and other digital resources.
---	--	---------------------------------------	---	--

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:	To increase student performance at levels 4 and 5 on the Algebra 1 EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% of students performed at level 4 and 4% performed at level 5.	16% of students will perform at levels 4 or 5 on the Algebra 1 EOC exam.

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	Appropriate levels of cognitive complexity/rigor present in classroom instruction, assignments and assessments.	Incorporate the Gradual Release Model and appropriate levels of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.  Use of appropriate stages of rigor in classroom instruction, assignments, and assessments.	Michelle Williams  Math Department Chairpersons	walkthroughs  lesson plan assessment	walkthrough document  lesson plans

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # By 2016-2017 84% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC exam. 3A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	71%	75%	78%	81%	

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:	Not Available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Not Available	X			
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:	Not Available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Available	Not Available

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	Providing additional support for struggling SWD students.	After school tutoring opportunities. Opportunity to receive additional support in the learning lab.	Toni Zetsche/ESE case managers	Progress of participating students will be monitored by case manager and Admin	Progress reports and report cards.

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:	Not Available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Available	x

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	Providing additional support for struggling Economically Disadvantaged students.	After school tutoring opportunities. Utilize Extended School Day resources to offer after school support in the Learning Lab.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by progress reports and report cards.

2	Access to after school instructional support.	Transportation through extended school day.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by report cards and progress reports.
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3E:	Not Available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not Available	x

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:	To increase student performance at proficiency or above on the Geometry EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Geom EOC: Mean T-Score of 50. 32% in High third. 39% in Middle third. 29% in Low third.	60% of first time test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Geometry EOC exam. 57% of all test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Geometry EOC exam.

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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the state EOC exam format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the blueprints for the EOC exams with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff	PLT Facilitators/Admin  Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments

		development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.			
2	Access to technology in preparing students for online testing.	Providing online assessment opportunities for students which mirror state testing requirements.  Use of responders in classroom assessments.  Use of iPad and iTouch devices to assist in increasing the digital experience of students.	Technology Specialist  Technology Specialist/Math Department	Monitoring student participation in online assessments.  Monitoring student participation in the use of responders in the classroom and other digital resources.	Computer Lab schedule.  Schedule of teacher use of classroom responders and other digital resources.

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:	To increase student performance at levels 4 and 5 on the Geometry EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% performed in the highest third. (T-Score data)	12% of students will perform at levels 4 or 5 on the Geometry EOC exam.

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	Appropriate levels of cognitive complexity/rigor present in classroom instruction, assignments and assessments.	Incorporate the Gradual Release Model and appropriate levels of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.  Use of appropriate stages of rigor in classroom instruction, assignments, and assessments.	Michelle Williams  Math Department Chairpersons	walkthroughs  lesson plan assessment	walkthrough document  lesson plans

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # By 2016-2017 84% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the Geometry EOC exam.				
3A :					
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	71%	75%	78%	

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.	Not available
---	---------------

Geometry Goal #3B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Not available	x			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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	Providing additional support for struggling SWD students.	After school tutoring opportunities. Opportunity to receive additional support in the learning lab.	Toni Zetzsche/ESE case managers	Progress of participating students will be monitored by case manager and Admin	Progress reports and report cards.

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:	Not available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not available	x

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	Providing additional support for struggling Economically Disadvantaged students.	After school tutoring opportunities.  Utilize Extended School Day resources to offer after school support in the Learning Lab.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by progress reports and report cards.
2	Access to after school instructional support.	Transportation through extended school day.	Jessica Meek	Monitor progress of participating students.	Academic progress as identified by report cards and progress reports.

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E:	Not available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not available	x

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
Cognitive Complexity  Classroom Rigor	9-12  Algebra 1, Algebra 1A, Algebra 1B, Geometry	Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Math PLTs - Algebra & Geometry	Semester 1	walkthroughs  common assessments	Michelle Williams

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

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:		To increase the number of students scoring level 4, 5 and 6 on the FAA.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
71% of students scored level 4, 5 and 6 on the FAA.		74% of students are expected to score level 4, 5 and 6 on the FAA			
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	Provide students will the opportunity to participate in assessments that mirror the complexity of the FAA.	Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity and building common assessments that mirror the FAA.	Admin/PLT facilitator	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common Assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2:	To increase the number of students scoring at or above level 7 on FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1% of students scored at or above level 7 on the FAA.	5% of students are expected to score at or above level 7 on the FAA.

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	Providing integrated science lessons that mirror the complexity level of the FAA.	Staff development in cognitive complexity and building common assessment tools.	Admin/ PLT facilitator.	Common assessments and lesson plans.	Common assessments.

## 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:	To increase student performance at proficiency or above in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Biology EOC: Mean T-Score of 50. 26% in High third. 40% in Middle third. 35% in Low third.	60% of first time test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Biology EOC exam. 55% of all test takers will demonstrate proficiency on the Biology EOC exam.

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	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the state EOC exam format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the blueprints for the EOC exams with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin  Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments
2	Access to technology in preparing students for online testing.	Providing online assessment opportunities for students which mirror state testing requirements.  Use of responders in classroom assessments.  Use of iPad and iTouch devices to assist in increasing the digital experience of students.	Technology Specialist  Technology Specialist/Math Department	Monitoring student participation in online assessments.  Monitoring student participation in the use of responders in the classroom and other digital resources.	Computer Lab schedule.  Schedule of teacher use of classroom responders and other digital resources.
	Providing opportunities to experience	Develop common assessments	PLT Facilitators	Monitoring student performance on	Common assessments

3	assessments which mirror the state EOC exam format and level of difficulty.	incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the blueprints for the EOC exams with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	common assessments.	including Core K-12 Tests.
---	---	--	---------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.  Biology Goal #2:	To increase student performance at levels 4 and 5 on the Biology EOC exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% performed in the highest third. (T-Score data)	12% of students will perform at levels 4 or 5 on the Biology EOC exam.

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	Appropriate levels of cognitive complexity/rigor present in classroom instruction, assignments and assessments.	Incorporate the Gradual Release Model and appropriate levels of Cognitive Complexity in classroom instruction.  Use of appropriate stages of rigor in classroom instruction, assignments, and assessments.	Jessica Meek  Science Department Chairperson	lesson plan  assessment  walkthrough document	lesson plans

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
Cognitive Complexity  Classroom Rigor walkthroughs  common assessments	9-12  Biology	Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Science PLT's	Semester 1	walkthroughs  common assessments	Jessica Meek

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

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:	To increase the percentage of students achieving a 3.0 and higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% of students scored a 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing. 20% of students scored a 4.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing.	96% of students will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing. 50% of students will score a 4.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 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
1	Student preparation for a demand writing assessment.	Writing Assessment Cycle, including both narrative and expository prompts, administered through 10th grade Language Arts classes.	Charlene Prahasky and Language Arts Department Chairs	Monitor student performance on the Writing Assessment Cycle.	Writing Assessment Cycle data

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:	To increase the percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on the writing alternative assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78.5% of students scored a 4 or higher on the 2012 Alternative Assessment in writing.	83% of students will achieve a score of 4 or higher on the 2013 Alternative Assessment 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
1	Student preparation for a writing assessment.	Incorporate daily writing practice in classroom lessons.	ESE instructional staff	Student performance on writing assessments	Performance writing data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.  U.S. History Goal #1:	
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
1	Providing opportunities to experience assessments which mirror the state EOC exam format and level of difficulty.	Develop common assessments incorporating questions formatting in the same manner as the blueprints for the EOC exams with a focus on the cognitive complexity levels.  Provide staff development on the levels of Cognitive Complexity.	PLT Facilitators/Admin  Admin/K-12 Literacy Coach	Monitoring student performance on common assessments.	Common assessments
2	Access to technology in preparing students for online testing.	Providing online assessment opportunities for students which mirror state testing requirements.  Use of responders in classroom assessments.  Use of iPad and iTouch devices to assist in increasing the digital experience of students.	Technology Specialist  Technology Specialist/Math Department	Monitoring student participation in online assessments.  Monitoring student participation in the use of responders in the classroom and other digital resources.	Computer Lab schedule.  Schedule of teacher use of classroom responders and other digital resources.

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

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:	Success at Hudson High School directly relates to daily school attendance. Currently our attendance rate is 90.6%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Data shows our 2012 attendance rate to be 90.6%	Hudson High School's expected rate of attendance is 95%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Data shows 16% students have Excessive Absences.	Students with Excessive Absences will be reduced by 4% by June 2013.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Data shows 15% students have Excessive Tardies.	Students with Excessive Tardies will be reduced by 5% June 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Delayed and inaccurate attendance reporting for early intervention daily	Correct school wide attendance reporting procedures so that prompt and effective interventions can take place.	Toni Zetzsche	Attendance plan constructed by the attendance committee	Monitoring of Attendance Improvement action plan.

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:	To reduce the number of referrals processed and OSS assigned as a disciplinary intervention.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 0 days of in-school suspension assigned to students as a disciplinary intervention during the 2011-2012 school year.	We expect 0 days of In-School suspension to be assigned to students during the 2012-2013 school year as a discipline intervention.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
There were 0 students Suspended In School as a result of a disciplinary intervention during the 2011-2012 school year.	We expect that 0 students will be assigned suspension In School for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 1522 days of Out-of-School suspension assigned as a disciplinary intervention during the 2011 school year.	We expect that less than 1272 days of Out-of-School suspension will be assigned as a result of disciplinary action by the school for 2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
There were 217 students Suspended Out-of-School for violations of the student code of conduct.	We expect that less than 198 students will be assigned Out-of-School suspension for violations of the student code of conduct.

### 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
Lack of a culture that includes as a priority a	Assist teachers through a comprehensive	Discipline Committee.	Regular monitoring of suspension rates by	TERMS reports.

1	classroom discipline intervention plan that focuses on keeping students in class.	school-wide discipline plan that focuses on keeping students in class.		committee. Reports to staff.	
---	---	--	--	------------------------------	--

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:	To increase the graduation rate and to decrease the dropout rate. 80% of students in each grad year cohort will be on target for graduation by earning the minimum

<i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	number of credits as designated in the Pasco County Student Progression Plan by July 2013.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
2011-12 Dropout Rate information not available. Freshmen: 66.7% on track as of August 2012 Sophomores: 70.6% on track as of August 2012 Juniors: 71.6% on track as of August 2012	2010-11 Expected Dropout Rate: .95% 2011-12 Expected Dropout Rate: .95% 2012-13 Expected Dropout Rate: .95%  80% of each cohort will be on track by July 2013.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
2011-12 Graduation Rate information not available. Freshmen: 66.7% on track as of August 2012 Sophomores: 70.6% on track as of August 2012 Juniors: 71.6% on track as of August 2012	2009-10 Graduation Rate: 70% 2010-11 Graduation Rate: 85% 2011-12 Expected Graduation Rate: 68% 2012-13 Expected Graduation Rate: 70% 80% of each cohort will be on track by June 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited availability of credit recovery options for students.  Number of students behind in credits.  Limited support resources for students	Credit Recovery program in a lab setting offered during the school day.  SSAP model of support for at-risk students.  Implementation of school-wide IMPACT program.	M. Williams/ C. Prahasky	Monitoring of students behind in credits.	Grad Summary Report by cohort  Credit Recovery Lab reports  SSAP student contact logs  IMPACT agendas

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

*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:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>			To increase the number of events designed for parent participation.		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
Two events in 2011-12: Open House and Curriculum Night			4 planned events for 2012-13		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Staff participation in outside events/activities.	Provide incentives and recognition for staff participation.	Administration	staff participation	staff sign-in sheet
2	Parent participation.	Multiple methods of communication advertising events and encouraging participation.	Administration	parent participation	Observed number of parents in attendance.

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:			Increase the awareness and number of students participating in career academies.		
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		Provide or discuss CTE information in all classes on a monthly basis.	CTE department Admin	Yearly review of the number of students/groups that participate in CTE.	Roster of students enrolled in CTE.

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)

### Post-Secondary Readiness Goals Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Post-Secondary Readiness Goals Goal Post-Secondary Readiness Goals Goal #1:		To increase the percentage of students who demonstrate readiness to pursue post-secondary educational/career opportunities.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
2011-12 data not available.		80% of graduating seniors will demonstrate post-secondary readiness through appropriate scores on the SAT, ACT or PERT as determined by State Board of Education Rule 6A- 10.0315, F.A.C.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Financial cost of SAT/ACT testing.	Awareness of reduced cost for students on free/reduced lunch.	R. Marsh	Participation in ACT/SAT testing.	ACT/SAT school report
	Student buy-in.	Increase student awareness of the benefits and need for post-secondary readiness.	R. Marsh	Number of students seeking assistance from R. Marsh.	Percent of students demonstrating post-secondary readiness.

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

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

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

### Budget:

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

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

*End of Post-Secondary Readiness Goals Goal(s)*

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/26/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The School Advisory Council at Hudson High School will meet regularly to assist in the implementation of school-wide improvement priorities. Members regularly meet to discuss and evaluate progress towards goals and assigning resources in their control accordingly.



# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Pasco School District HUDSON HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	40%	73%	76%	37%	226	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	46%	75%			121	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?	48% (NO)	58% (YES)			106	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					463	
Percent Tested = 93%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Pasco School District HUDSON HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	44%	69%	81%	30%	224	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	50%	72%			122	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?	45% (NO)	63% (YES)			108	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					464	
Percent Tested = 95%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested