FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Wiregrass Ranch High School	District Name: District of School Board of Pasco County
Principal: Raymond Bonti	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Alisa Cimino	Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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	Raymond Bonti	Social Science 6-12 School Principal (All Levels)	6	20	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11-A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Assistant Principal	Robyn White	Math 6-12 Educational Leadership (All Levels) Middle Grades	6	7	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low)

		Endorsement			09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11-A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Assistant Principal	Diamela Vergne	Biology 6-12 Educational Leadership (All Levels)	6	6	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11-A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Assistant Principal	Jimmy DuBose	Middle Grades English ESOL Endorsement Journalism Education Leadership (ALL Levels)	5	9	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11-A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Assistant Principal	Shauntte Butcher	English 6-12 Educational Leadership (All Levels)	3	6	07/08 – B (PRSMS—Read: 59% Prof, 62% LG, 65% Low; Math: 53% Prof, 71% LG, 73% Low) 08/09 – A (PRSMS---Read: 64% Prof, 68% LG, 77% Low; Math: 59% Prof, 73% LG, 74% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11-A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years

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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy Coach (Shared Position)	Christine Schimpf	Elementary Education Reading Endorsement Educational Leadership (All Levels)	6	3	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11- A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Media Specialist	Karen Boyd	Media Specialist Reading Endorsed Middle Grades Endorsement Social Studies 6 - 12	6	6	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11- A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years
Technology Specialist	Yonique Waller	Business Education	5	2	07/08- C (Read: 45% Prof, 51% LG, 41% Low; Math: 77% Prof, 79% LG, 70% Low) 08/09 – B (Read: 49% Prof, 53% LG, 55% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 75% LG, 58% Low) 09/10 – B (Read: 50% Prof, 53% LG, 46% Low; Math: 80% Prof, 76% LG, 61% Low) 10/11- A (Read: 50%, Prof, 52% LG, 50% Low; Math: 83% Prof, 76% LG, 57% Low) 11/12 – N/A (Read: 62% Prof, 70% LG, 69% Low; Math: 71% Prof, 65% LG, 56% Low) AYP has not been met all five years

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Partnerships in place with the State University System	Administrators, Department Heads	As needed
2. Team of educators and administrators to interview the applicants so that the best match is found for our students	Administrators, Department Heads	As needed/continuous process
3. New Teacher Mentoring Program	Administrators, Clinical Mentor Liaison, Department Heads, Mentor Teachers	June 2013
4. Stay current with new trends and technology.	Administrators	June 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.
*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
4	Currently taking classes in order to add an endorsement to their certificate or receive certification in the content taught.

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
116	10% (12)	36% (42)	34% (39)	19% (22)	35% (40)	100% (116)	10% (12)	3% (3)	14% (16)

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
Math	Megan Cannon	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.

Science	John Gant	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Language Arts	Lorena Lucas	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Language Arts	Da'Ondra Martin	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
ESE	Daniel Plein	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.

Math	Zack Podkormorski	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
AMP	Andrew DeLloyd	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Language Arts	Megan Stresser	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Math	Lisabeth Leist	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.

Math	Graig Chapman	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Reading	Patricia Bacon	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Reaading	Amanda Vaughn	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Science	Kim George	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.

Science	Melissa Taylor	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Social Studies	John Quinlivan	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.
Social Studies	Derek Kubinski	Mentor pairings were determined on the following basis: Mentor teacher certification(s), Mentor/Mentee current teacher assignment(s), Mentor Clinical-Ed Training completion, Mentor's years of teaching experience, and Mentor's ability to work with others by teaching and coaching. In addition, each mentor has been evaluated as being a highly skilled teacher in instructional skills and classroom management.	An assistant principal along with the Mentor liaison will facilitate bi-weekly after school meetings to discuss various topics. Mentors/Mentees will meet as needed to discuss common lesson planning and incorporation of best practice strategies. Mentees will have the opportunity to observe Model classrooms and discuss their observations with their Mentors and supervising assistant principals.

Dr

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Ray Bonti-Principal Shauntte Butcher – Assistant Principal/Discipline Diamela Vergne – Assistant Principal/ESE Patrick Beahon – School Psychologist Kelli Johnson-School Social Worker Allison Kanewa – School Guidance Counselor Melinda Kantor – ESE Department Head Matthew Bailey-ESE Staffing & Compliance Teacher Chris Schimpf- K12 Literacy Coach Yonique Hacker – School Technology Specialist Nora Light- English Teacher Ira Kittling – School Nurse David Wilson – SSAP Teacher
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The School-based MTSS Leadership Team meets monthly to review screening data, identify students, and identify appropriate supports based on the problem solving approach. The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. The school psychologist participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. The behavior specialist and ESE team of teachers provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with students. The general instruction teacher acts as a vehicle for communicating teacher concerns, insights, and suggestions about how to best integrate supports in the classroom. The MTSS Leadership Team works with other school teams to share ideas regarding how to manipulate time with a high school schedule to accommodate support for struggling students as well as share successes in progress monitoring tools, screening techniques, and interventions. In addition to communicating with other school teams, the MTSS Leadership Team frequently visits support websites such as The Response to Intervention Action Network for updated data-based success strategies and tools.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The purpose of the school improvement plan is to specify areas where the school fell short in its performance, set measurable goals, and determine a plan of action. Because MTSS is an academic and behavioral intervention designed to provide assistance to students who are having difficulty learning or has continuous behavioral issues, the overall result aligns with the goals set in the School Improvement Plan. Members of the MTSS Leadership team help to provide data and recommends strategies to overcome the barriers with these students. The members of the MTSS Leadership team will provide school faculty and staff with workshops and resources to understand the Role of the MTSS Leadership team. The MTSS team analyzes data to determine whether goals are being met, identify barriers, and provide solutions. They assist in developing an action plan to move toward accomplishing the goals of the School Improvement Plan.

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. Data derived from system-generated attendance reports, discipline reports, FAIR reading score reports, Core K12 benchmark testing, EOC Assessments, FCAT, students' grade reports, and teacher- developed documentation will be used to summarize students' progress. PASCO STAR, as well as a modifiable school-based database designed to store all data, will be accessed and used by all team members and administrators to maintain the fidelity of data entered and hence used to make all intervention decisions.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The trained MTSS Leadership Team will train teams of teachers through Lunch-n-Learns throughout the school year. In addition, the implementation of MTSS practices and prescribed interventions will be monitored during walk-throughs.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The MTSS team will also conduct sit-downs with teachers for reinforcements of the Lunch-n-Learn trainings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Shauntte Butcher-Assistant Principal Christine Schimpf-K12 Literacy Coach Karen Boyd – Media Specialist Melinda Kantor – ESE Department Head Carmen Simpson-Reading Teacher Megan Sanborn -Reading Teacher Amanda Vaughn- Reading Teacher Eshonda Swackard-Reading Teacher Patricia Bacon-Reading Teacher Paula Berry – English Teacher/ Benchmark Assessment Coordinator Jennifer Isley-English Teacher Wanda Diehm – Social Studies Teacher Paul Vassak – Social Studies Teacher/ Benchmark Assessment Coordinator Lisa Alaimo – Mathematics Teacher/ Benchmark Assessment Coordinator Nicolas Cuviello – Science Teacher/ Benchmark Assessment Coordinator
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT meets monthly to develop a school wide Literacy focus and focus for LNL breakout sessions. The WRHS Lead Literacy Team is responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing comprehensive school-wide literacy programs, which facilitate student learning and support teachers. Some LLT members model best practice lessons, which use literacy-based learning strategies and coach teachers in all curriculum areas on how to enhance students' literacy skills. The LLT also identifies staff development needs of the school to provide staff development related to literacy as part of the problem solving process.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT for the 2012-13 school year is to continue Benchmark assessments for the core subject areas of English and World History to increase Literacy skills. Members of the LLT will streamline the Benchmark Assessments. Teacher will administer the common benchmark assessments to all students in the same course and grade level at the end of each quarter. Teachers will use these standardized assessments to evaluate the degree to which students have mastered selected standards in both their classrooms and compare with other grade-level specific classrooms in the school. These assessments are designed to drive instruction and increase student ability level in the area of Literacy.

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

All teachers will implement research-based literacy strategies and lesson planning to ensure that non-fiction reading is incorporated into all classrooms. They will provide effective instruction that includes a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of students' learning styles across all cultures. All teachers will prepare students for the FCAT 2.0 Reading by developing and implementing diagnostic and prescriptive methods to increase FCAT performance across the curriculum and implementing activities to encourage positive attitudes in students toward testing. We will provide avenues of assistance for under-achieving students, particularly those not making adequate progress towards graduation by identifying those students needing assistance, providing alternative teaching strategies, facilitating group counseling and tutoring opportunities, implementing academic improvement plans and providing intensive reading classes. We will ensure that teachers are addressing rigor and relevance in classroom assignments to meet the needs of differentiated instruction by conducting walk-through observations as well as informal and formal observations followed by individual conferences.

High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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 school has many courses that are embedded into specific academies and career programs. These courses are relevant to a specific career and can end with industry certifications. 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. The programs include areas in Health Science, Food Preparation and Computer Certification courses.

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

The school ensures that courses are offered to meet the student's graduation needs as well as meet their career interests. The students choose their own academic and elective courses every year with the guidance of their teachers and counselors. Our school provides a wide range of courses to choose from. Students are provided with training sessions on how to use FACTS.org and ePep to assist them in making proper choices in their academic planning.

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.

Information Gathered from The High School Feedback Report: Wiregrass Ranch High School (65.5%) is above the district (53.7%) and state (60.2%) average for students who complete a college prep curriculum. Students who took the SAT (54.2%) were above the district (42.4%) and state (51.3%) averages in addition to students who take the ACT (58.9%) were above the district (50.2%) and state (54.6%) averages. The percent of graduates who complete at least one AP or Dual Enrollment course (42.8%) was above the district (37.0%) average.

Our Advanced Placement Program continues to shine, with a 62% pass rate in 2012. Students passing at least one AP exam increased in 2012 from 61% to 68% with the state average being 51% and global average being 61%. In the 2012 – 2013 school year, we have added one more dual enrollment courses. We have also awarded many industry certifications for students in the Information Technology Academy and Medical Professions Academy. It is our goal to develop well-rounded individuals that can succeed outside of the high school setting.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. The English curriculum maps only include approximately 30% of standards tested on the FCAT Reading 2.0.	1A.1. Develop common assessments aligned to the FCAT Reading 2.0 and inclusive of the English curriculum in grades 9 and 10.	1A.1. Assistant Principal Common Assessment Coordinator English teachers	1A.1. English teachers will analyze data on common assessment questions and quarterly exams.	1A.1. FAIR Data Common Quarterly exams
Reading Goal #1A: *The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *68%*					
			1A.2. The core instruction does not provide explicit instruction in the terminology/vocabulary utilized on most standardized tests including the benchmark assessments (FCAT).	1A.2. Teachers will continue to review specific terminology related to the subject at hand, specifically breaking down the word to its prefix, suffix, and roots. (Morphemes)	1A.2. Assistant Principal Lead Literacy Team	1A.2. Teachers will analyze data from quarterly exams.	1A.2. Teacher terminology assessments FAIR OPM
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. Students may not have the vocabulary necessary to support the curriculum.	1B.1. Teachers will emphasize fluency, vocabulary and reading comprehension.	1B.1. ESE teachers Assistant Principal	1B.1. ESE teachers will analyze the data on pre and posttest.	1B.1. Teachers Assessment (Pre and Post Test
Reading Goal #1B: *The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 t in the Reading portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance/.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *22%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *24%*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. The instruction in the advanced classes (honors and Advanced Placement) is more content-focused than literacy skilled focused, rarely including explicit instruction in comprehension strategies	2A.1. Teachers will deliver instruction focusing on teaching pre, during, and after-reading strategies, so that students will know how to "attack" the text.	2A.1. K-12 Literacy Coach	2A.1. Daily/weekly formative assessments	2A.1. Teacher generated assessments FAIR OPM Bulls Eye Data Charts
Reading Goal #2A: *The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *35%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *39%*					
			2A.2. The literature utilized in advanced classes (honors and Advanced Placement) is usually dense and above student comprehension levels	2A.2. Teachers will provide instruction focused on text structure and text-marking strategies to help students manipulate and comprehend the text.	2A.2. K-12 Literacy Coach	2A.2. Teachers will collect and review formative assessment data bi-weekly to determine individual student progress and inform instructional decisions.	2A.2. Teacher Formative Assessments
			2A.3. Technology is not provided on a 24/7 basis to expand learning.	2A.3. 125 Freshman/Sophomore students will be involved in a 1 to 1 iPad initiative expansion to create opportunities to read a variety of literature anytime, any place.	2A.3. iPad English Teacher Technology Specialist Assistant Principal	2A.3. The iPad team will review student and parent surveys as well as student work to determine the effectiveness of using technology to increase reading scores	2A.3. FAIR OPM Teacher generated common assessments
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. Students may not have the vocabulary necessary to support the curriculum.	2B.1. Teachers will emphasize fluency, vocabulary and reading comprehension.	2B.1. ESE teachers Assistant Principal	2B.1. ESE teachers will analyze the data on pre and posttest.	2B.1. Teachers Assessment (Pre and Post Test
Reading Goal #2B: *The percentage of students at Levels above 7 in the Reading portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *28%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31%*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. The core instruction does not provide explicit instruction in the terminology/vocabulary utilized on most standardized tests including the benchmark assessments (FCAT).	3A.1. Teachers will continue to review specific terminology related to the subject at hand, specifically breaking down the word to its prefix, suffix, and roots.	3A.1. Assistant Principal Lead Literacy Team	3A.1. Teachers will analyze data from quarterly exams.	3A.1. Teacher terminology assessments FAIR OPM
Reading Goal #3A: *The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *70%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *77%*					
			3A.2. Students who made learning gains have not previously been identified nor targeted with specific reading skill instruction.	3A.2. The K-12 Literacy Coach will provide all teachers with a list of identified students making learning gains for teachers to provide instruction on identified reading strategies.	3A.2. K-12 Literacy Coach Content Area Department Heads	3A.2. Teachers will assess students on the use of text-marking strategies bi-weekly.	3A.2. Quarterly common assessments FAIR OPM
			3A.3. Students do not see a connection between what they are doing in class and the FCAT Reading 2.0 exam	3A.3. Students will monitor their own progress on common quarterly exams.	3A.3. Assistant Principal Common assessment coordinator English teachers	3A.3. Students will use the Bulls Eye Data Charts in all English II classes, to graph their progress on each of the English standards.	3A.3. Quarterly assessments Bulls Eye Data Charts
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. Students may not have the vocabulary necessary to support the curriculum.	3B.1. Teachers will emphasize fluency, vocabulary and reading comprehension.	3B.1. ESE teachers Assistant Principal	3B.1. . ESE teachers will analyze the data on pre and posttest.	3B.1. Teachers Assessment (Pre and Post Test
Reading Goal #3B: *The percentage of students proficient in the Reading portion of the CELLA will increase by 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *53%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *58%*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Core instruction in the intensive reading class provides support for many students to improve their reading skills, but not to achieve proficiency in specific areas of need	4A.1. Reading teachers will provide explicit instruction in areas of specific needs within the reading classroom. Content area teachers will provide follow-up instruction on how to apply these same strategies.	4A.1. Assistant Principal K-12 Literacy Coach	4A.1. Teachers will assess students on specific strategies and use the data to drive instruction. The Literacy team will review the percentage of students scoring medium to high on FAIR assessments	4A.1. Teacher assessments FAIR OPM
Reading Goal #4A: *The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *69%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *76%*					
			4A.2. Content area teachers rarely include explicit instruction in text-marking strategies.	4A.2. Content area teachers will continue to provide explicit instruction on identified text-marking strategies and how to apply them to text within the classroom.	4A.2. K-12 Literacy Coach English Department Head	4A.2. Literacy Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period with English teachers to determine student's progress and inform instructional decisions.	4A.2. FAIR OPM Common Assessments
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 50%	**62%**	**81%**	**90.5%**	**95.25%**	**97.63%**	**100%**
Reading Goal #5A: ***The achievement gap in the Reading portion of the FCAT 2.0 will be reduced by 50%.***							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1. Core curriculum does not consistently have access to resources that would allow for student-choice in reading selections.	5B.1. Teachers will be provided with a variety of reading selections to enable students to choose reading that allow them to connect with the text. Media Specialists will assist teachers and student in finding full-text articles on specified content within the students' lexile range and in their first language.	5B.1. Assistant Principal K12 Literacy Coach Media Specialists Department Heads	5B.1. Literacy Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period with English teachers to determine student's progress and inform instructional decisions.	5B.1. Common Assessments FAIR Assessment
Reading Goal #5B: ***At least 81% of all ethnic subgroups will achieve proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test OR there will be 10% fewer non-proficient students. (466 TOOK TEST)***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Proficient levels* White: 62% Black: 43% Hispanic: 47% Asian: 64% American Indian: 67%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 72% Black: 53% Hispanic: 57% Asian: 74% American Indian: 77%					
	School Accountability Report-Adequate Yearly Progress		5B.2. The classroom instruction does not provide time for supplemental instruction to students with individual needs.	5B.2. Students will be enrolled into Extended School Day classes and have the opportunity to make use of after school tutoring programs.	5B.2. Assistant Principal	5B.2. Teachers assess students on the use of specific strategies and skills weekly to determine if students know how to use and apply the skill.	5B.2. Weekly teacher assessments
			5B.3. Students do not see a connection between what they are doing in class and the FCAT Reading 2.0 exam	5B.3. Students will monitor their own progress on common quarterly exams.	5B.3. Assistant Principal Common assessment coordinator English teachers	5B.3. Students will use the Bulls Eye Data Charts in all English II classes, to graph their progress on each of the English standards.	5B.3. Quarterly assessments Bulls Eye Data Chart

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Core curriculum does not consistently have access to resources that would allow for student-choice in reading selections.	5C.1. Teachers will be provided with a variety of reading selections to enable students to choose reading that allow them to connect with the text.	5C.1. Assistant Principal K12 Literacy Coach Media Specialists Department Heads	5C.1. Literacy Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period with English teachers to determine student's progress and inform instructional decisions.	5C.1. Common Assessments FAIR Assessment
Reading Goal #5C: ***The percentage of English language learners (ELL) making AYP on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *8%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *18%*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Core curriculum does not consistently have access to resources that would allow for student-choice in reading selections.	5D.1. Teachers will be provided with a variety of reading selections to enable students to choose reading that allow them to connect with the text.	5D.1. Assistant Principal K12 Literacy Coach Media Specialists Department Heads	5D.1. Literacy Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period with English teachers to determine student's progress and inform instructional decisions.	5D.1. Common Assessments FAIR Assessments
Reading Goal #5D: ***The percentage of students with disabilities)SWD)making AYP on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *12%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *22%*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Core curriculum does not consistently have access to resources that would allow for student-choice in reading selections.	5E.1. Teachers will be provided with a variety of reading selections to enable students to choose reading that allow them to connect with the text.	5E.1. Assistant Principal K12 Literacy Coach Media Specialists Department Heads	5E.1. Literacy Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period with English teachers to determine student's progress and inform instructional decisions.	5E.1. Common Assessments FAIR Assessments
Reading Goal #5E: ***The percentage of economically disadvantaged students making AYP on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test will increase 10% from current level of performance..***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *12%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *22%*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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
Technology Inclusion	9 – 12	Various	School-Wide	Monthly Faculty meetings	Walk-throughs	All administrators
PLC	9 -12	LC Leaders	School-Wide	Monthly LC meetings	Documentation of best practices	All administrators Leadership Team
Data Analysis	9 – 12	Testing/Benchmark Coordinators	School-Wide	Monthly Department meetings	Assessment Data	Department Head All administrators

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Extended School Day	Teachers and materials	District Funds	$2655.00
Common Assessments	Copies of common assessments/scantrons	Internal Funds	$2486.00
Student Progress Monitoring	Copies of Student Charts	Internal Funds	$35.00
			Subtotal: $5176.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide a variety of reading sources	Scholastic Magazines	Internal Funds	1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
			Total: $6,176.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Students are limited in the English Language.	1.1. Students are placed in Developmental Language Arts (DLA) and/or Intensive Reading to allow students to demonstrate progress in English Language Development.	1.1. ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	1.1. CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	1.1. CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA Online Language Learning software assessments
CELLA Goal #1: *The percentage of students proficient in the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA will increase by 10%.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *9th – 60%* *10th – 53%* *11th – 63%* *12th – 75%*					
		1.2. Core instruction in the DLA and/or intensive reading class provides support for many students to improve their English skills, but not to achieve proficiency in specific areas of need	1.2. ESOL Certified Teachers Use of best practices in the classroom Access to additional language development rssources	1.2. . ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	1.2 CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	1.2. CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA Online Language Learning software assessments
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students are limited in the English Language.	2.1. Students are placed in Developmental Language Arts (DLA) and/or Intensive Reading to allow students to make continuous progress demonstrate progress in English Language Development	2.1. ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	2.1. CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	2.1. CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA Online Language Learning software assessments
CELLA Goal #2: *The percentage of students proficient in the Reading portion of the CELLA will increase by 10%.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *9th – 40%.* *10th – 12%* *11th – 25%* *12th – 38%*					
		2.2. Core instruction in the DLA and/or intensive reading class provides support for many students to improve their English skills, but not to achieve proficiency in specific areas of need	2.2. ESOL Certified Teachers Use of best practices in the classroom Access to additional language development rssources	1.3. 2.2. ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	2.2. CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	2.2. CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA Online Language Learning software assessments
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		3.1. Students are limited in the English Language.	3.1. Students are placed in DLA and/or Intensive Reading to allow students to make continuous progress demonstrate progress in English Language Development	3.1. ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal	3.1. CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	3.1.CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA ONINE Language Learning software assessments
CELLA Goal #3: *The percentage of students proficient in the Writing portion of the CELLA will increase by 10%.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *9th – 20%* *10th – 24%* *11th – 13%* *12th – 63%*					
		3.2. Core instruction in the DLA and/or intensive reading class provides support for many students to improve their English skills, but not to achieve proficiency in specific areas of need	3.2. ESOL Certified Teachers Use of best practices in the classroom Access to additional language development rssources	2.2. ESOL Resource Teacher DLA Teacher Intensive Reading Teacher Assistant Principal	3.2. CELLA Test IRT Initial Assessment	3.2. CELLA Test FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes CELLA ONINE Language Learning software assessments
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading skills	Leveled Readers Series	Textbook Funds	600.00
Reading Skills	Longman Keynote Textbook Series	Textbook Funds	300.00
			Subtotal: 900.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Listening, Speaking Writing, Reading Skills	IPads with Apps (Keynote, Pages, Translate, IBook)	Tittle III Funds	3,000.00
Listening, Speaking Writing, Reading Skills	Tell Me More (Interactive Online Resource	Tittle III Funds	1,000.00
			Subtotal: 4,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Listening, Speaking Writing, Reading Skills	Lunch & Learn	Internal Funds	50.00
Listening, Speaking Writing, Reading Skills	District Office Training	District Funds	200.00
			Subtotal: 250.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 5,150.00

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. Students may not have the prerequisites mathematical computational and/or numerical recognition skills.	1.1. Teachers will teach math computation skills and numerical recognition	1.1. ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	1.1. .Pre and Post Test	1.1. Teacher Assessment.
Mathematics Goal #1: *The percentage of students scoring at levels 4,5,and 6 in the Math portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	22%.	*24%*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. Students may not have the prerequisites mathematical computational and/or numerical recognition skills.	2.1. Teachers will teach math computation skills and numerical recognition	2.1.ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	2.1.Pre and Post Test	2.1.Teacher Assessment.
Mathematics Goal #2: *The percentage of students scoring above Level 7 in the Math portion the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	22%.	*24%*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. Students may not have the prerequisites mathematical computational and/or numerical recognition skills.	3.1. Teachers will teach math computation skills and numerical recognition	3.1. ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	3.1. Pre and Post Test	3.1. Teacher Assessment.
Mathematics Goal #3: *The percentage of students making learning gains in the Math portion of the Florida Alternate assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *58%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *64%*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *No data*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *No data*					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. The effective implementation in the math department towards monitoring of the student progress in the EOC exams (Algebra)	1.1. Develop a progress monitoring system for the Algebra EOC	1.1. Assistant Principal Common Assessment Coordinator Algebra teachers	1.1. Algebra teachers will analyze data on common assessment questions and quarterly exams.	1.1. Core K12 Assessments Common Quarterly exams Bulls Eye Data Chart
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on the Algebra end of course exams will increase by 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *55%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *61%*					
			1.2. The core instruction does not provide explicit instruction of mathematics terminology.	1.2. Teachers will continue to review specific terminology related to the subject at hand, specifically breaking down the word to its prefix, suffix, and roots.	1.2. Assistant Principal Lead Literacy Team	1.2. Teachers will analyze data from quarterly exams.	1.2. Terminology assessments
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Instruction does not reflect the consistent use of higher order thinking skills to provide depth of knowledge in instruction.	2.1. Teachers will infuse higher order thinking skills within instruction and in varying forms of assessment. The addition of 100 students to the iPad group will add higher order thinking skills to the content taught.	2.1. Assistant Principal Mathematics Department Head Algebra teachers	2.1. Lesson plans Walk through observations	2.1. Core K12 Tests Algebra EOC Assessments Bulls Eye Data Charts
Algebra Goal #2: *The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the mathematics end of course exams will increase 10% from current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *7%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *17%*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 83% FCAT Data	**71% (EOC Data)**	**85.5%**	**92.75%**	**96.38%**	**98.19%**	**100%**
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: ***The percentage of students proficient in the Algebra EOC will increase by 10%.***							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**			3B.1.	3B.1. All lower level Algebra students have been placed in a double block of math to include Intensive Mathematics.	3B.1. Assistant Principal Algebra teacher	3B.1. All students who did not pass the 8th grade FCAT were placed in a double block of math to support their individual needs. Data will be analyzed at the end of each Chapter to drive instruction.	3B.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: ***There will be a 10% increase in proficiency on the math end of course exam OR at least there will be 10% fewer non proficient students***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 59% Black: 51% Hispanic: 43% Asian: 73% American Indian: 50%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 69% Black: 61% Hispanic: 53% Asian: 83% American Indian: 60%					
			3B.2. Evidence-based interventions used during supplemental instruction are not intensive interventions matched to individual student needs.	3B.2. After school tutoring programs will be available for those students who need specific interventions based on their individual needs	3B.2. After school teachers Classroom teachers	3B.2. Teachers will analyze data for specific needs on common assessments.	3B.2. Common assessments Core K12 Data After school data
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3C.1. All lower level Algebra students have been placed in a double block of math to include Intensive Mathematics.	3C.1. Assistant Principal Algebra teacher	3C.1. All students who did not pass the 8th grade FCAT were placed in a double block of math to support their individual needs. Data will be analyzed at the end of each Chapter to drive instruction.	3C.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: ***The percentage of English language learners (ELL) making AYP on the 2013 EOC Algebra test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *20%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30%*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3D.1. All lower level Algebra students have been placed in a double block of math to include Intensive Mathematics.	3D.1. Assistant Principal Algebra teacher	3D.1. All students who did not pass the 8th grade FCAT were placed in a double block of math to support their individual needs. Data will be analyzed at the end of each Chapter to drive instruction.	3D.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: ***The percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making AYP on the 2013 EOC Algebra test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *32%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *42%*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3E.1. All lower level Algebra students have been placed in a double block of math to include Intensive Mathematics	3E.1. Assistant Principal Algebra teacher	3E.1. All students who did not pass the 8th grade FCAT were placed in a double block of math to support their individual needs. Data will be analyzed at the end of each Chapter to drive instruction.	3E.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *The percentage of Economically Disadvantage students making AYP on the 2013 EOC Algebra test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *40%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50%*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. The effective implementation in the math department towards monitoring of the student progress in the EOC exams (Geometry)	1.1. Develop a progress monitoring system for the Geometry EOC	1.1. Assistant Principal Common Assessment Coordinator Geometry/Algebra teachers	1.1. Geometry teachers will analyze data on common assessment questions and quarterly exams.	1.1. Core K12 Assessments Common Quarterly exams Bulls Eye Data Chart
Geometry Goal #1: *The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on the Geometry end of course exams will increase by 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *53%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *58%*					
			1.2. The core instruction does not provide explicit instruction of mathematics terminology.	1.2. Teachers will continue to review specific terminology related to the subject at hand, specifically breaking down the word to its prefix, suffix, and roots.	1.2. . Assistant Principal Lead Literacy Team	1.2. Teachers will analyze data from quarterly exams.	1.2. Terminology assessments
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. Instruction does not reflect the consistent use of higher order thinking skills to provide depth of knowledge in instruction.	2.1. Teachers will infuse higher order thinking skills within instruction and in varying forms of assessment. The addition of 100 students to the iPad group.	2.1. Assistant Principal Mathematics Department Head Geometry/Algebra teachers	2.1. Lesson plans Walk through observations	2.1. Core K12 Tests Geometry EOC Assessments Bulls Eye Data Charts
Geometry Goal #2: *No data for levels 4 and 5 in Geometry EOC*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012** 83% FCAT Data	**55% (EOC Data)**	**77.5%**	**88.75%**	**94.38%**	**100.00%**
Geometry Goal #3A: ***The percentage of students proficient in the Algebra EOC will increase by 10%.***						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3B.1. All lower level Algebra students will be offered after school tutoring program	3B.1. Assistant Principal Geometry/Algebra teacher	3B.1. All students who did not pass Algebra EOC will be offered make up opportunities as well as after school programs.	3B.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Geometry Goal #3B: ***There will be a 10 % increase in proficiency on the math end of course exam OR at least there will be 10% fewer non proficient students***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 53% Black: 46% Hispanic:48% Asian: 50% American Indian 51%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 63% Black: 56% Hispanic: 58% Asian:60% American Indian: 61%				
		3B.2. Evidence-based interventions used during supplemental instruction are not intensive interventions matched to individual student needs.	3B.2. After school tutoring programs will be available for those students who need specific interventions based on their individual needs	3B.2. After school teachers Classroom teachers	3B.2. Teachers will analyze data for specific needs on common assessments.	3B.2. Common assessments Core K12 Data After school data
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3C.1. All lower level Algebra students will be offered after school tutoring program	3C.1. Assistant Principal Geometry/Algebra teacher	3C.1. All students who did not pass Algebra EOC will be offered make up opportunities as well as after school programs	3C.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Geometry Goal #3C: *The percentage of English language learners (ELL) making AYP on the 2013 Geometry test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *35%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *45%*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3D.1. All lower level Geometry students will be offered after school tutoring program	3D.1. Assistant Principal Geometry/Algebra teacher	3D.1. All students who did not pass Algebra EOC will be offered make up opportunities as well as after school programs	3D.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Geometry Goal #3D: *The percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making AYP on the 2013 EOC Geometry test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *40%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50%*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. The class period does not incorporate time for supplemental instruction/ intervention on a regular basis.	3E.1. All lower level Algebra students will be offered after school tutoring program	3E.1. Assistant Principal Geometry/Algebra teacher	3E.1. All students who did not pass Algebra EOC will be offered make up opportunities as well as after school programs	3E.1. Common assessments Core K12 Data
Geometry Goal #3E: ***The percentage of Economically Disadvantage students making AYP on the 2013 EOC Algebra test will increase by 10% from current level of performance.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *46%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *56%*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	9 – 12	Various	School-Wide	Monthly Faculty meetings	Walk-throughs	All administrators
Data Analysis	9 – 12	Testing/Benchmark Coordinators	School-Wide	Monthly Department meetings	Benchmark Assessments	Department Heads Testing/Benchmark Coordinators All administrators
Core K-12 Analysis	9 -12	Diamela Vergne	School-Wide	Fall, Winter, Spring	Data Charts	All administrators

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student Progress Monitoring	Copies of Student Charts	Internal Funds	35.00
			Subtotal: 35.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Ipad Expansion	Ipads and Applications	District Technology & Media Funds	47,925.00
			Subtotal: 47,925.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Higher Order Thinking	AP Teacher Training	Internal AP Budget	1,000.00
			Subtotal: 1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Curriculum	Textbooks/Workbook	Textbook Funds	5,323.91
			Subtotal: 5,323.91
			Total: 54,283.91

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. Students may lack higher order thinking skills to process scientific concepts.	1.1. Teachers will help students solve problems using consensus, models, scientific laws and the Scientific Method.	1.1.ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	1.1. Student Assignments	1.1.Teacher Observation
Science Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring at levels 4,5,and 6 in the Science portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance.	*29%*	*32%*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. Students may lack higher order thinking skills to process scientific concepts.	2.1. Teachers will help students solve problems using consensus, models, scientific laws and the Scientific Method.	2.1. ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	2.1. Student Assignments	2.1. Teacher Observation
Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring above Level 7 in the Science portion the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% from current level of performance.	*0%*	*10%*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. Teachers do not often have a common time to meet with their colleagues to plan for instruction.	1.1. Teachers will be given time in department meetings to analyze data and determine the direction of instruction. In addition, teachers will develop common quarterly assessments.	1.1. Assistant Principal Common assessment coordinator Science Department Head All Science Teachers	1.1. Common Assessments will be given quarterly and data will be analyzed to drive instruction.	1.1. Common Assessment Data Bulls Eye data Charts
Biology 1 Goal #1: *The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on the Biology end of course exams will increase by 10% of current level of performance.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *52%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *57%*	Students do participate in their own progress monitoring but struggle with data analysis.	Students will monitor their own progress on common quarterly exams as well as Core K12 exams for Biology and Physical Science.	Assistant Principal Common Assessment Coordinator Biology Teachers	Students will use "Bulls Eye" chart in all Biology classes to graph their progress on each of the Biology standards tested on the Biology EOC. Physical Science students will also use the "Bulls Eye" chart.	Core K12 Data reports "Bulls Eye" Data
			1.2. Core instruction does not include explicit instruction of specific science vocabulary, as well as prefixes, suffixes, and roots of words..	1.2. All science teachers will continue to provide direct, explicit instruction in prefixes, suffixes, and roots utilizing content specific, grade-level vocabulary.	1.2. Science Department Head K12 Literacy Coach	1.2. Science teachers will assess students on the use of the specific terms bi-weekly to determine if the students comprehend the terminology.	1.2. Teacher assessments
			1.3. Supplemental instruction does not include direct instruction of specific needs beyond the designated curriculum map.	1.3. Students will participate in additional science tutoring after school hours to address areas of specific concern.	1.3. All Science Teachers	1.3. Evaluation of common assessment data and strand data analyzed by the science department head and teachers. In addition of Biology data analysis, the science department will also be introducing detailed physical science analysis.	1.3. Core K12 Benchmark Science Test End of Course Exam Teacher-made 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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Science curriculum needs to be focused on extended thinking skills.	2.1. Teachers will incorporate the depth of knowledge question stems on all formative and summative assessments as well as lab assignments.	2.1. Science Department Teachers Science Department Head Assistant Principal for Curriculum	2.1. Review of teacher lesson plans and observation of the lessons	2.1. Core K12 Tests Biology EOC Exam
Biology 1 Goal #2: *Data not available*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	9 – 12	Various	School-Wide	Monthly Faculty meetings	Walk-throughs	All administrators
Data Analysis	9 – 12	Testing/Benchmarks Coordinators	School-Wide	Monthly Department meetings	Benchmark Assessments	Department Heads Testing/Benchmark Coordinators All administrators
Core K-12 Analysis	9 -12	Diamela Vergne	School-Wide	Fall, Winter, Spring	Data Charts	All administrators

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student Progress Monitoring	Copies of Student Charts	Internal Funds	$35.00
			Subtotal: $35.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Ipad Expansion	Ipads and Application	District Technology & Media Funds	Included in Math section
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Higher Order Thinking	AP Teacher Training	Internal SP Budget	$1,000
Textbook Training	All Science Teachers	District Funds	$500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 1,535.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Students have few opportunities to engage in content specific writing across the curriculum.	1A.1. Teachers will incorporate content-specific writing into their lessons and include opportunities for mini-writing assignments weekly to summarize activities.	1A.1. English teachers K12 Content Area Teachers Literacy Coach	1A.1. The Lead Literacy Leadership Team will review writing data after each writing common assessment to determine the increase in the percent of students scoring 3.0 or higher	1A.1. Common writing assessments. Wiregrass Writes Assessment
Writing Goal #1A: *The percentage of students scoring a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing test will increase from 93% to 94%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *93%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *94%*					
			1A.2. Students are not provided with enough writing activities in Honors level courses.	1A.2. Rigorous-writing activities will be added to Honors level courses on a minimum of a quarterly basis.	1A.2. All honors teachers All administrators	1A.2. Review data collection provided by quarterly assessments, common writing assessments and Wiregrass Writes	1A.2. Common assessment results
			1A.3. Technology is not provided on a 24/7 basis to expand learning	1A.3. 125 Freshman/Sophomore students will be involved in a 1 to 1 iPad initiative expansion to create opportunities to do writing activities anytime, any place.	1A.3. iPad English Teacher Technology Specialist Assistant Principal	1A.3. The iPad team will review student and parent surveys as well as student work to determine the effectiveness of using technology to increase writing abilities.	1A.3. Wiregrass Writes
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Students lack of background knowledge creates written expression deficit.	1B.1.Teachers will increase background knowledge and assist in transferring that knowledge into writing	1B.1.ESE Teachers Assistant Principal	1B.1.Student assignments/writing samples	1B.1.Teacher Observation
Writing Goal #1B: *The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 or higher in the Writing portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase 10% of current level of performance*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55%*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Best Practices	9 - 12	English Dept Head	School-Wide	Aug – May	Benchmark testing in September and December	English Department Head Literacy Coach Assistant Principals

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Wiregrass Writes	Writing prompts, data collection	Internal Funds	1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IPad Expansion	Ipads and Applications	District Technology & Media Funds	Included in Math Section
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Lack of motivation to attend school and get to class on time.	1.1. Students who have less than 5 days absent and no tardies during a semester will be entered into a drawing for a reward.	1.1. Assistant Principal Attendance Committee	1.1. The attendance committee will review attendance and tardy data each month and will discuss interventions for those with excessive absences.	1.1. Monthly attendance reports
Attendance Goal #1: *The attendance rate for the 2013 School year will increase from 95% to 96%while the number of absences will decrease 5%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *94.69% TERMS SP031*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *95%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *610*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *580*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *0*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *0*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Attendance Professional Development

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
Attendance Training	9-12	Administrator	Attendance Committee Members	Monthly	Attendance Committee Monitoring	Attendance Committee
MTSS Training	9-12	Administrator	MTSS/Attendance Committee	Monthly	MTSS/Attendance Monitoring	MTSS/Attendance Committee

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reward gift cards for good attendance	4 Student Gift Cards	Internal-Principal Account	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School Check In	Materials	Internal funds	$400.00
Tardy Tables/SWITS	Paper Passes	Internal funds	$100.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $600.00

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. The school population has increased while the school has lost administrative resources and teacher positions.	1.1. Continue to implement alternatives to suspension, such as after school detention and Saturday detentions	1.1. Assistant Principal for discipline Discipline committee Behavior Specialist MMTS Team Instructional assistant for Student discipline	1.1. Monthly meetings to analyze collected data	1.1. Discipline survey TERMS Discipline Reports MMTS database
Suspension Goal #1: *The number of out of school suspensions will decrease by 10%..*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	320 *TERMS SP064*	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In –School					
	207 *TERMS SB268*	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	828 *TERMS SP064 (days)*	*745*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	181 *TERMS SB268*	*163*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

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
FBA Training	9-12	Behavioral Specialist	ESE Staff/Behavioral Specialist	Discipline Meetings	Monitoring of referrals	Discipline/MTSS Committee

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Saturday School/After School Detention	Behavioral interventions	SAC	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 3,000.00

End of Suspension Goals

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 next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Students struggle to finish credit recovery classes as needed	1.1. Continuation of the APEX system will be used to help students recover multiple credits	1.1. Assistant Principal for Curriculum Graduation Enhancement Teacher and Counselor	1.1. Data will be reviewed on credit attainment and progress toward graduation.	1.1. APEX Reports, Graduation plans
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: ***The percentage of students who dropout will continue to be lass than 1% and the percentage of students who graduate with their cohort will continue to be above 90%.***	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	Not available at this time..	*0.5%*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	Not available at this time.	*93%*					
			1.2. All students who have the potential to graduate with their cohort require constant monitoring, communication between school and home, and follow up on goals set from year to year.	1.2. All counselors and administrators have been assigned a cohort to track and mentor through the graduation requirements.	1.2. School guidance counselors All administrators	1.2. Data will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to include those students currently failing. Counselors and administrators will meet with those students who are struggling and assist in getting them on the right track.	1.2. TERMS Reports, teacher feedback.
			1.3.The FCAT may be an obstacle for some seniors in getting a standard diploma	1.3.Students who have earned a 30 on the ACT in reading and math tutored the students who have not passed the FCAT.	1.3.Guidance Counselors Assistant Principal	1.3.Tutoring sessions	1.3.ACT Scores

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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
Apex Training	9-12	District Trainer	Apex Teacher	All year	Analysis of data	Administrators

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
APEX	Cafeteria Coupons	Internal Funds	500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:$500.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Parents are not aware of all of the activities taking place on the school campus.	1.1. Continue to post all activities in a multitude of areas including, but not limited to, school marquee, website, School connects phone messages, School connects text messages, school mailings, twitter and collect parent information through electronic surveys.	1.1. Assistant Principals technology Coordinator	1.1. Parent participation in school activities including but not limited to Parent University/PTSA Educational Family Night and ACT Princeton Review Practice Test/Strategy Session	1.1. Attendance Rosters
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *The percentage of parents who participate in school activities will increase from 29% to 32%.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *29%* *5 Star Data*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *32%*					
			1.2. Communication does not go home in the student's home language.	1.2. Send out and/or post all communication about parent activities in English as well as Spanish.	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2. Track number of minority parents attending school events.	1.2. Parent Survey Attendance Rosters
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent University at the Ranch		Business Partnerships	$2000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
			Total: $2,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Advancing and integrating science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and 21st Century **Literacies. Expand the number of students who ultimately pursue advanced degrees and careers in STEM fields and broaden the participation of women and minorities in those fields.**	1.1. Students may have difficulties participating in after school activities.	1.1. Create activities that are conducive to the integration of science, technology and mathematics (Odyssey of the Mind, Learning Communities Expositions)	1.1. Science Teachers LC Communities	1.1. Student Participation	1.1. Data Collected
	1.2. Participating in hands-on learning experiences related to STEM careers	1.2. Provide students with science, math, and technological courses. Provide students with case studies that use real world scenarios.	1.2.Science, Math and Technology Teachers	1.2.Student Enrollment	1.2.Courses offered through master schedule
	1.3. Women and minorities have been under represented in the scientific fields	1.3. Students need to apply their knowledge of math and science to labs and hands-on projects. Concepts learned in their high school classrooms are linked to real-world practice.	1.3.Math and Science Teachers	1.3.USF Engineering Fair participation	1.3.Data Collected

STEM Professional Development

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Broaden the participation of students	USF Engineering Fair	Internal Funds	1,500.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: 1,500.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: ***Students in the CTE Program (IT Academy, Medical Academy, Culinary Arts Program) will increase their total certifications by 20%.*** ***2012 Data:*** ***83 - IT Academy Certifications*** ***23 - CNA Certifications*** ***27 – CMAA (Certified Medical Administrative Assistant)*** ***1 – EMR*** ***10 - Culinary Arts Program Certifications***	1.1. Students are not making connections between classroom instruction and real-world applications.	1.1. Teachers will provide more hands-on experiences as part of their curriculum.	1.1. CTE Program teachers Assistant Principal CTE Department Head	1.1. Teacher Assessments Simulated Assessments Skill-based assessments	1.1.Walkthroughts Teacher Observations
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Real life applications	Serve Safe/Pro Start Certifications (Culinary Arts)	CTE	1,500.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Real Life Applications	Competitions/Culinary Arts	CTE	700.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: 2,200.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: 6,176.00
CELLA Budget
Total: 5,150.00
Mathematics Budget
Total: 54,283.91
Science Budget
Total: 1,535.00
Writing Budget
Total: 1,000.00
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total: 600.00
Suspension Budget
Total: 3,000.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total: 500.00
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: 2,000.00
STEM Budget
Total:1,500.00
CTE Budget
Total: 2,200.00
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total: $77,944.91

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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.

X☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The SAC activities include grants, business partnerships for Parent University, after school programs and Saturday school. Other activities and duties of SAC members include: (1) Awareness of school operations (2) discussion of issues concerning school operations (3) Input and approval of School Improvement Plan (4) Data driven decision-making.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Saturday School/After School Detention	$3000.00