

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Gadsden

Principal: Dr. Kimball Thomas

SAC Chair: Mrs. Angela Burgess

Superintendent: Mr. Reginald James

Date of School Board Approval: October 23, 2012

Last Modified on: 1/15/2013

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning

gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Kimball Thomas	B.S. Elementary Ed M.S. Administration/Supervision PhD Educational Leadership	2	12	1993-1997 Kept James S. Rickards High School off FLDOE's 'Critically Low' list during tenure. 2011-2012 East Gadsden High School: Removed school from the F school list by improving the following: % Meeting High Standards in Reading from 18% to 31% % Making Learning gains in Reading from 32% to 48% % of lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading from 40% to 59% Percent of students proficient in writing from 67% to 80%
Assis Principal	Rebecca Gaines	B.S. Criminal Justice MS Elementary Ed. MS Educational Leadership	3	3	Ms. Gaines serves as the school's assistant principal for curriculum and on the

					school's RtI Leadership Team. She provides critical student success data to the Team and has been responsible for implementing the school's Master Schedule. Ms. Gaines also oversees school-wide testing.
Assis Principal	Andy Gay	BS Education MS Educational Leadership	9	10	Mr. Gay has been employed by the GCSD for 21 years, as a classroom teacher, Head Football Coach, Athletic Director, and an Assistant Principal for Discipline. During the subsequent school years of 2010-2012, EGHS has seen a 20% reduction in out-of-school suspensions and zero-tolerance incidents.
Assis Principal	Maurice Stokes	BS Psychology/Education MS Educational Leadership	1	3	Mr. Stokes has worked as a teacher, GEAR-UP Coordinator, Dean of Students and an Assistant Principal. He has played a major role in reducing out-of-school suspensions and zero-tolerance incidents at EGHS during the 201102012 school year. He currently leads the EGHS Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiative at the school.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Myra Grant		2	5	
Science	Melvin Flores	AB/BS-BSE in Biological Science Certificate Program in Teaching Chemistry MA in Educational Management Chemistry 6-12 and Biology 6-12 Certified	4	1	Mr. Flores is serving in his first year as Science Coach after serving as a very successful science teacher for several years at EGHS. He 's an outstanding planner and organizer.
Mathematics	Rhonda Cunningham	M.Ed. in Mathematics Education B.S. in Math and Computer Science National Board Certified	15	2	2009-2010- 100% of my students scored levels 3,4,5 for 10th and 11th graders. above 50% of students in Proficiency in mathematics in math population. 2010-2011-100% of my students scored levels 3,4,5 in FCAT Math for 10th, 11th

					graders. 2011-2012 Met learning goals for SIP goal set for Algebra I. Provided support so that school grade moved from "F"
--	--	--	--	--	---

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Job announcements preferring 'highly qualified' candidates Student Performance data Targeted-Selection Interviews CV or Resumes review for certification, experiences, job performance, and specific skills set	Principal Principal Principal, assistant principals, Instructional Coaches and pertinent staff	 08/19/2011 08/19/2011 08/19/2011	
2	All Staff are Highly Qualified under NCLB/FLDOE guidelines.			

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and strategies	Provide the strategies
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

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

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
56	16.1%(9)	19.6%(11)	30.4%(17)	30.4%(17)	12.5%(7)	100.0%(56)	14.3%(8)	1.8%(1)	12.5%(7)

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
Lynn Clark	Gabriel Johnson	Subject Area	Modeling
Delma Campbell	LaTanja Peoples	Subject Area	Modeling
Jeremy Lynch	Diane Frost-	Subject Area	Modeling

	Walker		
John Lubbers	Terrance Milton	Subject Area	Modeling
Shirlean Thomas	Willie McClurkin	Subject	Modeling
Douglas Stephens	Ericka Farmer	Years of Experience	Modeling
Melvin Flores	Dr. Uddell Madden	Science Coach	Modeling
Nakeshia Harris	Mashayla West	Subject Area	Modeling
Glen Soltes	Tracy Champagne	Subject Area	Modeling

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

EGHS receives funds for improving basic education programs for the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Odyssey software licenses have been purchased and professional development will be provided for Odyssey Ware.

Title I Director: Rose Raynack

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D

With the assistance of Title I, Part D, EGHS receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker, Ms. Sherrie Taylor, provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all Level 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

East Gadsden High offers Youth Crime Watch and Men of Distinction programs to students which include field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

Course choices for career interest and goals are evidenced by students choosing to participate in the Dual Enrollment program, taking advanced placement courses on campus, and participating in the career academy programs offered on campus, at Gadsden Technical Institute, and at the TCC-Pat Thomas Law Enforcement site.

Job Training

Course choices for career interest and goals are evidenced by students choosing to participate in the Dual Enrollment program, taking advanced placement courses on campus, and participating in the career academy programs offered on campus, at Gadsden Technical Institute, and at the TCC-Pat Thomas Law Enforcement site.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Dr. Kimball Thomas - Principal; Rebecca Gaines - Assistant Principal for Curriculum/Instruction; Carla Wells - Reading Coach; Tammy Sherman - Reading Teacher/Coach; Angela Sapp - Science Coach; Rhonda Cunningham - Math Coach; Julie McEachin - DOE Reading Specialist; Curtis Richardson - SIG Coordinator; Shirlean Thomas - Guidance Chair; Dimitri Salters - Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator; Anthony James - Behavior Specialist, and Linda Thomas - ESE Specialist

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

1. Team meets bi-weekly to review ,monitor and implement operational changes regarding student performance data.
2. Team or individual members are designated to meet with other school teams(bi-weekly or monthly) to review, monitor and inform of student progressions needs or operational changes.

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

The RtI Leadership Team reviews student progression data with respect to school improvement needs. Recommended changes based on this data was made to the SIP.

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 sources that were analyzed were as follows: FLDOE School Grades and AYP Reports, District Baseline Data Reports, Write Scores Report, FAIR Assessment Reports through PMRN and Data Director.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Comprehensive In-service and review of Florida's RtI Model.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Kimball Thomas - Principal; Rebecca Gaines - Assistant Principal for Curriculum/Instruction; Carla Wells - Reading Coach; Tammy Sherman - Reading Teacher/Coach; Angela Sapp - Science Coach; Rhonda Cunningham - Math Coach; Julie McEachin - DOE Reading Specialist; Curtis Richardson - SIG Coordinator; Shirlean Thomas - Guidance Chair; Dimitri Salters - Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator; Anthony James - Behavior Specialist and Linda Thomas- ESE Specialist

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

1. Team meets bi-weekly to review ,monitor and implement operational changes regarding student performance data.
2. Team or individual members are designated to meet with other school teams(bi-weekly or

monthly) to review, monitor and inform of student progressions needs or operational changes.

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

To review literacy student progression data, i.e. reading and writing scores and make changes to instructional strategies to improve school-wide literacy, which is inclusive of Sustained Silent Reading(across the curriculum) and guided instruction for reading Novels, improving reading rigor through text complexity that will coordinate with Accelerated Reading initiatives.

Public School Choice

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

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

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

NA

***Grades 6-12 Only**

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

East Gadsden High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum, enrolled in Algebra I course before 9th grade, completed at least one level 3 high school math course only 1.2% below the district average, and completed Dual Enrollment (DE) math course was above the district average. These areas are above the state average, but East Gadsden High is focused on creating a greater emphasis on math preparedness. We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans. This will

include sharing information and requirements to become eligible for Bright Futures. During common planning, teachers will review charts tracking graduation requirements and Bright Futures requirements and intervene as necessary.

***High Schools Only**

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

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

We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans.

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?

We will also encourage students to take AP, IB, or DE classes by encouraging more teacher discussion on these courses and having each student speak with a guidance counselor regarding their postsecondary plans.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.

To increase the number of students scoring at achievement level 3 in reading.

Reading Goal #1a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In 2012 41%(91)students achieved a level 3 on FCAT Reading.

In 2013, 41% or more students are expected to maintain a level 3 or above on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.	1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals.	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.	1.1 In-service/Workshops	1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.
2	1. Differentiated Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for DI activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. 2. Rigor.	1. Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through PLC's, Lesson Studies, and state/school mandates. The Reading Coach, Myra Grant will	Principal and Assistant Principals and the Reading Coach	FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absences. Data chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs.	FAIR, FCAT, Bi-Weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans IPDPs

<p>3. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers).</p>	<p>be responsible for progress monitoring and data collections of all assessments. Beginning the 2nd Nine weeks teachers will sign up to observe best reading practices/strategies used by other academic classes. They will then have biweekly cluster meetings and debrief with the Reading Coach. Suggestions will be given to the academic teachers for school based improvement. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students - teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students - teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students - teach, enrich.</p> <p>2. Designing more rigorous lessons in lesson Study PLCs.</p> <p>3. Data Chats</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

		between principal and teachers. 4. IPDP meetings with coaches.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

NA

Reading Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

To maintain or increase the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

Reading Goal #2a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

16%(34) students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.

Students will score 16% or above Achievement Level 4 in FCAT 2.0 Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

		for Monitoring		
1	1.Lack of across discipline collaboration.	1. To provide in-service on across discipline collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.	1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys 1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines plan.
2	Differentiated Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. 4. Rigor. 5. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers.	Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach	FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans, IPDPs.

	<p>The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes:</p> <p>Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich.</p> <p>Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich.</p> <p>Level 3 students – teach, enrich.</p> <p>5.Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs.</p> <p>6.Data Chats between principal and teachers.</p> <p>IPDP meetings with coaches.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

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

**2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement
Level 7 in reading.**

Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.

To maintain or increase the number of students making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

48% of student made learning gains in reading.

48% or higher of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.Lack of common goals for student success.	1. To provide PD on common goals across disciplines for student success.	1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team, Instructional Coaches, Department Chairs.	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Common Goal Plan for students making learning gains.
2	Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served,	Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which	Principal, Assistant Principals, and Math Coach	FAIR,FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor	FAIR, FCAT, Weekly focus lesson assessments,

	<p>specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. 4. Rigor.</p> <p>Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers.</p>	<p>will be done through Tammy Sherman - reading coach. 2nd, 3rd, 4th period teachers will visit 6th and 7th periods and debrief during lesson study. Teachers will debrief on a bi-weekly basis. Focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom Level 1 -teach, reteach, remediate Level 2-teach and reteach Level 3 - teach and enrich. Designing more standard aligned assessments lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches.</p>		<p>lowest quartile students based on mini-assessments. Data chats will be held in all math classrooms.</p>	<p>Bi-weekly Lesson Plans, IPDPs.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

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

**3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making Learning
Gains in reading.**

Reading Goal #3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

**4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in
Lowest 25% making learning gains in
reading.**

To maintain or increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #4:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

59% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.

59% or more students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of common goals for student success.	1. To provide PD on across disciplines common planning goals for student success.	1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team and Department Chairs.	1. In-service/Workshops	1. Across Discipline Common Goals Plan for students in the lowest 25 % making

					learning gains.
2	<p>Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. Rigor.</p> <p>Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers.</p>	<p>Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers.</p>	Principal and Assistant Principals and the Reading Coach	FAIR, FCAT, FCIM. Monitor tardies and absences. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly.	FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments. Lesson Plans, IPDPs.

		IPDP meetings with coaches.			
--	--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

Reading Goal # 5A : 

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

To reduce the percentage of minority students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

31% of minority students made satisfactory progress in reading, an increase of 13% from the previous year.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

To increase the number of minority students making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Differentiate Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management.	Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays	Principal Asst. Principal for Curr., RTI Leadership Team. Reading Coach.	FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absences. Data Chats with students. Classroom Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students	FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, Lesson Plans, IPDPs.

	<p>Rigor. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD teachers.</p>	<p>beginning the 2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers. IPDP meetings with coaches.</p>		<p>and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly.</p>	
--	---	---	--	--	--

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in N/A

reading.

Reading Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.Lack of awareness and common goals for ELL students.	1. To provide PD on ELL students learning strategies	1.Principal, RtI Leadership Team, ESOL Teacher.	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Across Disciplines Common Goals for ELL students success.
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

N/A

Reading Goal #5D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. lack of awareness of SWD learning strategies and	1. Ti provide in-service and training for teachers with	1. Principal, ELL Teacher, RtI Leadership	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys.	1. Surveys/Common Goals for ELL students' success

	common goals for success.	respect to common goals for SWD success.	Team.		plan.
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

To reduce the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

31% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading.

To increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of awareness and common goals for students that are economically disadvantaged success.	1. To provide PD for teachers with respect to success for ED students.	1. Principal, RtI Leadership Team	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Common Success Goal Plan for ED students
2	Differentiated Instruction is not evident in all classrooms being served, specifically the following components: planning for D.I. activities (lesson plans), grouping, management. Rigor. Alignment of instruction and interventions being delivered in the double-blocks (i.e., Reading teachers and CARPD	Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be run by Reading Coach Tammy Sherman on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays beginning the	Principal Asst. Principal for Curriculum Reading Coaches	FAIR, FCAT, FCIM focus lesson assessments. Monitor tardies and absenses. Data Chats with students. Classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will monitor lowest quartile students and target bubble students and differentiate instruction accordingly.	FAIR, FCAT. Bi-weekly focus lesson assessments, lesson plans, IPDPs.

<p>teachers.</p>	<p>2nd Nine weeks. Teachers will sign up to observe 2nd, 3rd, and 4th periods and debrief with Tammy Sherman during the 6th and 7th period the same day of the observation. The debrief session will focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson. Classroom mobility for all classes: Level 1 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 2 students – teach, re-teach, enrich. Level 3 students – teach, enrich. Designing more rigorous lessons in Lesson Study PLCs. Data Chats between principal and teachers.</p>			
------------------	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the CELLA.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of PD for faculty/staff that instruct ELL students.	1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff.	1. Principal, ELL Teacher, District ELL Coordinator.	1. In-service/Workshops.	1. The increase of ELL students scores on the CELLA in listening/speaking.

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in reading on the CELLA.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of PD for ELL faculty/staff.	1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff.	1.Principal, District ELL Coordinator.	1. In-service/Workshops	1. Increased CELLA results in students scoring proficient in reading.

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

To increase the number of ELL students scoring proficient in writing on the CELLA.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. lack of PD for ELL faculty/Staff.	1. To provide PD for ELL faculty/staff.	1. Principal, District's ELL Coordinator.	1. In-service/Workshops	1. Increased CELLA Writing Proficiency results of ELL students.

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

**1. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in
mathematics.**

Mathematics Goal #1:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

**2. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Level 7 in
mathematics.**

Mathematics Goal #2:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

**Responsible Effectiveness of
for Strategy
Monitoring**
No Data Submitted

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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

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

Mathematics Goal # 5A : 

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not

making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of Rigorous assessments used in the classroom and complexity of items aligned to EOC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus •Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted will be submitted to the math coach for review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal ,Dr. Thomas •Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham •ETO, Lillie Stokes •DA Mathematics Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus •Teacher to Teacher lesson Study/ PLC •Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted will be submitted to the math coach for review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student Performance EOC State Assessments proficieny results •Classroom observation tools
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provide training for clarification and sample math lessons to demonstrate to teachers what differentiation instruction looks like. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS and Teacher to Teacher PLC •Lesson plans with differentiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal ,Dr. Thomas •Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham •ETO, Lillie 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Training teachers in differentiated activities from FDLRS and Teacher to Teacher PLC •Lesson plans with differentiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Student Performance on District/School baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments

		activities •Classroom implementation of differentiated activities	Stokes •DA Mathematics Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli	activities •Classroom implementation of differentiated activities	•Student Performance EOC State Assessments proficiency results •Classroom observation tools
--	--	--	---	--	--

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

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

Data Not available from the District as of September 27, 2012

Mathematics Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

- State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains
- State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics
- State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

50% of Algebra ELL students will perform Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC

- State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.Lack of awareness and common goals for ELL students.	1. To provide PD on ELL students learning strategies	1.Principal, RtI Leadership Team,	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Across Disciplines Common Goals for

			ESOL Teacher.		ELL students success.
2	Training to teacher for teaching ELL students	NcarPD training for all teachers	District personnel over NcarPD training ESE Specialist Reading Coach	Implementation in classroom	School and State Assessment performance of students

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

In 2011-2012 : State results only 33% of all Algebra students who took the Algebra EOC pass with Level 3 or higher

Mathematics Goal #5D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

- State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains
- State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics
- State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics
- State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

50% of the SWD (Students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Algebra will be placed in Access Algebra.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. lack of awareness of	1. Ti provide in-service and	1. Principal, ELL	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson	1. Surveys/Common

	SWD learning strategies and common goals for success.	training for teachers with respect to common goals for SWD success.	Teacher, RtI Leadership Team.	Studys.	Goals for ELL students' success plan.
2		Students will be placed in an Access algebra course	Principal ESE Specialist	Math Coach will provide needed textbook and resources to teachers as needed	Assessments by ESE Specialist

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

In 2011-2012 33% of all Algebra students performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC who were enrolled in Algebra I.

Mathematics Goal E:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

- State results : 41% Percentage of students making learning gains
- State results: 45% Percent of lowest 25% making learning gains at proficiency level in mathematics
- State Results: 49% Percentage of students (total) scoring at proficiency level in mathematics
- State Results: 33% of students in Algebra performed at Level 3 or higher on Algebra EOC

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012-2013-50% of all math students in Algebra I will score a Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of awareness and common goals	1. To provide PD for teachers with respect to success	1. Principal, RtI Leadership	1. In-service/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Common Success Goal Plan

	for students that are economically disadvantaged success.	for ED students.	Team		for ED students
2	Teachers have a training of culture teaching students of all backgrounds	Students will be enrolled in Algebra I and inclusion students will also be enrolled in Algebra I and other learning challenged students will be enrolled in Access Algebra Teachers have a training of culture teaching students of all backgrounds	Principal ESE Specialist	Math Coach will provide needed textbook and resources to teachers as needed	ESE Specialist Teacher evaluation State performance on EOC

End of High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. In June 2012- Projected 19% (35 students) Algebra I EOC students total (187) will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 EOC

Algebra Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 33% of students scored at proficiency level on the Algebra 1 EOC

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2013 - Projecting 50% of (200 students) Algebra 1 students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 EOC

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring		
1	1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.	1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals.	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.	1.1 In-service/Workshops	1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.
2	1. Lack of Pacing of instruction and focus on lessons were not targeted accurately for the category of the test that was most tested which was Linear Equations, Inequalities and Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study with Rigor as the focus •Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review <p>Refocus focus calendar</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal, Dr. Thomas •Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham •ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes •DOE Math Specialist- Martha Gioeilli 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principal observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
3	2)Teacher need assistance and training with linking skills/chunking skills strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus •Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal, Dr. Thomas •Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham •ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes •DOE Math 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Teacher Assessments •Classroom walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principal observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance

		<p>Refocus focus calendar</p> <p>Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed</p>	<p>Specialist- Martha Gioielli</p>	<p>pictures, videos, observations forms, outline and lesson revisions)</p>	<p>on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
4	<p>3)Lack of instructing rigorous problems, teaching using Complexity of problems and EOC assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus •Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal, Dr. Thomas •Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham •ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes •DOE Math Specialist- Martha Gioielli 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Teacher Assessments •Classroom walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principal observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
5	<p>Traditional classroom teaching. Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies</p>	<p>Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies and professional development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal, Dr. Thomas •Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham •ETO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Teacher Assessments •Classroom walkthrough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principal observation •Progress

		<p>learning</p> <p>Teachers will deliver lessons via SMART Board Activities, FCAT Explorer, in conjunction with math textbooks and other resources.</p>	<p>Specialist, Lillie Stokes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE Math Specialist- Martha Gioeilli 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<p>Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
6	Lack of Differentiated instruction activities in the classroom	<p>Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be done through lesson study with teachers and visitation of math and science classes. 4th period planning teachers will observe 3rd period teachers teaching and 3rd period planning teachers will observe 4th period teachers teaching on a bi-weekly basis. At the end of each lesson study a meeting will be held once a month to debrief with math coach. Focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Principal, Dr. Thomas •Math Coach, Mrs. Rhonda Cunningham •ETO Specialist, Lillie Stokes •DOE Math Specialist- Martha Gioeilli 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Teacher Assessments •Classroom walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principal observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District Baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments

		<p>extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom</p> <p>Level 1 students (low performing level students)- teachers will teach, reteach, remediate</p> <p>Level 2 (medium performing) students-teachers will teach and reteach</p> <p>Level 3 (high performing students)-teachers will teach and enrich.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.

In June 2012- Projected 19% (35 students) Algebra I EOC students total (187) will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on Algebra 1 EOC

Algebra Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 33% of students scored at proficiency level on the Algebra 1 EOC

In Spring (May) 2013 - Projecting 50% (200 students) Algebra 1 students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 EOC

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Lack of collaboration across discipline.	1. To provide in-service on across discipline	1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional	1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines

	collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	Coaches and Department Chairs.		plan.	
2	Lack of technology and technological interaction in classrooms	Provide Smartboard Interactive training to motivate teachers to incorporate technology tools in their lessons to ensure effective learning and enrichment and engagement	Principal ,Dr. Thomas Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough •Class implementation of interactive technology use for students and teachers •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough/ •Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions)
3	Provide teachers with Common Core Introduction through the Eight Mathematical Practices, and Algebra I standards.	Teacher to Teacher PLC with Math Coach as facilitator on 8-mathematical practices Coach Regional meetings materials implemented in Classroom by teachers	Principal ,Dr. Thomas Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plan strategies •Classroom implementation of the practices •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough/ •Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions)
4	Increase us of hands-on projects and enrichment	Train the mathematics department on how STEM	Principal ,Dr. Thomas Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plan strategies •Classroom implementation of the practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough/

activities through STEM training	can increase motivation of students to learn math concept. Collaboration among math and science teacher on STEM activities.	Coach, Rhonda Cunningham Educational Transformation Office (ETO), Lillie Stokes DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli	•Teacher to Teacher PLC and Lesson study on STEM practices PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions)	•Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos. observations forms, outline and lesson revisions)
----------------------------------	---	---	--	---

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC

Geometry Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 17% (22) students were at state average 50 or higher on the Geometry EOC

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.	1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-service for faculty to develop and implement common goals.	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.	1.1 In-service/Workshops	1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading

					Level 3.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pacing Guide instruction and focus on lessons were not targeted accurately for the category of the test that was most tested two dimensional geometry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson study with Rigor as the focus •Monthly lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review Refocus focus calendar Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are focused and followed 	<p>Principal,Dr. Thomas</p> <p>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham</p> <p>ETO, Lillie Stokes</p> <p>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom Walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principl Observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Teacher need assistance with linking and chunking skills strategies through hands-on were demonstrated during monthly PLCs and Lesson Studies as facilitaed by Math Coach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson study with Rigor as the focus •Monthly lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review Refocus focus calendar Classroom walkthrough to make sure pacing guide and calendars are 	<p>Principal,Dr. Thomas</p> <p>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham</p> <p>ETO, Lillie Stokes</p> <p>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans •Classroom Walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principl Observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points

		focused and followed			on School Quarter Assessments
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of instructing rigorous problems, teaching using complexity of problems and EOC assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson Study and PLC with Rigor as the focus •Monthly Lesson plans with complexity of problems, activities and assessments are submitted to the math coach for review 	<p>Principal, Dr. Thomas</p> <p>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham</p> <p>ETO, Lillie Stokes</p> <p>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lesson plans and Teacher Assessments •Classroom Walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principi Observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
5	Lack of Teacher use of differentiation activities in the classroom	Differentiated Instruction will be addressed through the model classroom which will be done through lesson study with teachers and visitation of math and science classes. 4th period planning teachers will observe 3rd period teachers teaching and 3rd period planning teachers will observe 4th period	<p>Principal, Dr. Thomas</p> <p>Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham</p> <p>ETO, Lillie Stokes</p> <p>FDLRS training</p> <p>DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, M. Gioielli</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FDLRS Training materials •Lesson plans and Teacher Assessments •Classroom Walkthrough •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. videos, pictures, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DOE and Math Coach Walkthrough •Principi Observation •Progress Monitoring Results of Student Performance on District baseline, Midyear and Spring Assessments •Student

		<p>teachers teaching on a bi-weekly basis. At the end of each lesson study a meeting will be held once a month to debrief with math coach. Focus on the planning, delivery, assessment, and extension activities of each lesson will be the discussion. Classroom Mobility grouping model in their classroom</p> <p>Level 1 students (low performing level students)- teachers will teach, reteach, remediate</p> <p>Level 2 (medium performing) students-teachers will teach and reteach</p> <p>Level 3 (high performing students)-teachers will teach and enrich.</p>			performance growth points on School Quarter Assessments
--	--	---	--	--	---

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.

In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC

Geometry Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2012- State results: 17% (22) students were at state average 50 or higher on the Geometry EOC

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In Spring (May) 2013-Projecting 35% (275 students) Geometry students will score FCAT Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Lack of across discipline collaboration.	1. To provide in-service on across discipline collaboration for students scoring at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	1. Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.	1. Inservice/Workshops/Lesson Studys	1. Surveys/ Common Goal across disciplines plan.
2. •Lack of technology and technological interaction in classrooms	•Provide Smartboard Interactive training to motivate teachers and students to incorporate technology tools in their lessons to ensure effective learning and enrichment and engagement	•Principal, Dr. Thomas •Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham •Educational Transformation Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes •DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli	•Lesson plan strategies •Classroom Walkthrough •Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions)	•Lesson plans •Classroom walkthrough •Lesson study/PLC Documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observations forms outline and lesson revisions)
3. Provide teachers with Common Core Instruction through the 8-mathematical practices and	Teacher to teacher PLC with facilitation by Math Coach on 8-mathematical practices Coach	•Principal, Dr. Thomas •Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham •Educational Transformation	•Lesson plan strategies •Classroom instruction implementation •Common Core Learning goals plan •Teacher implementation in	•Lesson plan strategies •Classroom observations •Common Core Learning goals plan

Algebra I standards	Regional Common Core Mathematical materials implementation during PLC	Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes •DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli	classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions)	•Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions)
4 Increase us of hands-on projects and enrichment activities through STEM training	Train the mathematics department on how STEM can increase motivation of students to learn math concept. Collaboration among math and science teacher on STEM activities.	•Principal, Dr. Thomas •Mathematics Coach, Rhonda Cunningham •Educational Transformation Office, (ETO), Lillie Stokes •DA Mathematics/STEM Instructional Specialist, Martha Gioielli	•Lesson plan strategies •Classroom instruction implementation •Common Core Learning goals plan •Teacher implementation in classroom of hands-on experiments, projects and other STEM related activities •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC on STEM activities documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation forms, outline and lesson revisions)	•Lesson plan strategies •Classroom observations •Common Core Learning goals plan •Teacher implementation in classroom interactive technology use for students and teachers •Teacher to Teacher Lesson study/PLC documentation (i.e. pictures, videos, observation

				forms, outline and lesson revisions)
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

**1. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**

Science Goal #1:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

**2. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**

Science Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.

On the 2012 Biology 1 EOC 37% (71) of the students performed at Tier 2 and T3 proficiency levels.

Biology Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

37% (T2 and T3)
31% (T2) 59 students
6% (T3) 12 students

On the Biology 1 EOC 42% of the students will score at T2 and T3 proficiency levels.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inadequate non-traditional classroom experiences	Provide students with in depth exposure to activities, guest speakers and fieldtrips to enhance their background	Assistant Principal Curriculum, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson	Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be limited to following: Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments,	Improvement on the science mini-assessments and district assessments.

		knowledge to assist in real world application of concepts and develop critical thinking skills as related to science.		Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and quarterly review of growth made by students.	
2	Lack of rigorous instruction	<p>Teachers will continue to incorporate research based instructional strategies learned during NGCARPD, AP, and Bioscopes professional development, Biology Partnership, Lesson Study and Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Teachers will deliver lessons via SMART Board Activities, FCAT Explorer, GIZMO in conjunction with science textbooks and other resources.</p> <p>Two STEM academies are available to provide avenues of acceleration for advanced learners.</p>	Assistant Principal Curriculum, Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson	Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be limited to following: Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments, Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and quarterly review of growth made by students.	Improvement on the science mini-assessments and district assessments.

		<p>Biology teachers use lesson plans that have been collaboratively created and developed by science teachers in Lesson Studies, Bioscopes, Curriculum Track and Biology partnership.</p> <p>Professional Development on adopted science curriculum for full use of all components. Biology- Pearson Environmental – Pearson Chemistry – Pearson Physical Science – Pearson</p> <p>Professional Development on supplemental planning for labs or stations in Chemistry, Physical Science and Earth Space Science</p>			
3	Lack of laboratory experiences	Teachers will conduct laboratory experiences at	Assistant Principal Curriculum,	Assessment and monitoring tools will include, but not be	Improvement on the science mini-

		least twice a week. Labs supplies and materials have been ordered according to teachers' request and more are available upon request.	Science Coach, Science Department Chairperson	limited to following: Laboratory Write-ups, Teacher feedback, Post Tests, Mini Lesson Assessments, Daily informal classroom observations, weekly review of lesson plans, cluster meetings, science rubric assessments and quarterly review of growth made by students.	assessments and district assessments.
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.

Biology Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning

Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Science Budget:

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

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.

To increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in writing by 3%.

Writing Goal #1a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

80%

84%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Writing across the curriculum with fidelity.	All teachers will use preselected guided writing prompts on given days to assure fidelity.	RtI Leadership Team Principal, Asst. Principal, Reading Coach.	Monthly writing prompt data.	FCAT Writing.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.

Writing Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.

To score at the State's Baseline average.

U.S. History Goal #1:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA

To score at the State's Baseline average.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of across disciplines collaboration on common goal for	1.1 To plan collaboration opportunities strategies/in-	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum,	1.1 In-service/Workshops	1.1 Across Discipline Common Goal for

	students scoring at FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.	service for faculty to develop and implement common goals.	Instructional Coaches and Department Chairs.		students scoring @ FCAT 2.0 Reading Level 3.
2	Lack of PD for Social Science teachers.	Provide PD fore Social Science Teachers.	Principal, District's k-12 Director, Social Science Department Chair.	In-service, Lesson Studys and workshops.	U.S. History EOC State's baseline results compared to EGHS results.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.

NA

U.S. History Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

NA

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD	Grade	PD	PD	Target	Strategy for	Person or
----	-------	----	----	--------	--------------	-----------

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

U.S. History Budget:

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

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance

- 1. To increase the attendance rate from the previous year.
- 2. To reduce the number of excessive absences(10) or more and excessive tardies(10) or more.

Attendance Goal #1:

2012 Current Attendance Rate:

2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

95

97

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

254

204

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

291

239

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students apathy regarding school attendance and tardiness.	1.1. Students will be given incentives during the grading period to attend school and to be on time for class.	1.1. Drop-out Prevention Coordinator and Behavior Specialist	1.1. Daily attendance reports will be reviewed and students will be counseled with respect to attendance/tardy progress.	Daily attendance reports.
2	1.2. parent apathy regarding school attendance/tardies.	1.2. Parents will be contacted when students miss school and get tardy referrals.	1.2. Drop-Out Prevention coordinator and Behavior Specialist	1.2 Daily Attendance Reports will be reviewed and parents called	Daily attendance reports. Teacher call records.

				accordingly.	Automatic dialer reports.
3	1.3. Teacher attendance record keeping.	1.3. Teachers will be required to keep accurate daily attendance.	1.3. Teachers, Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator and Behavior Specialist	1.3 Teachers' daily attendance record per AS400 reports.	AS400 reports and teacher gradebooks.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Suspension

To reduce the number of students' in-school and out-of-schools suspensions from the previous year.

Suspension Goal #1:

2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions

2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

534

208

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School

2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

309

128

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

719

220

2012 Total Number of Students

2013 Expected Number of Students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students lack respect for each other, adult authority and school rules.	1.1. Students will receive consistent review of school rules per the code of Student Conduct by teachers and via grade-level assemblies.	1.1. Administration and teachers	1.1 Student referrals, ISS, OSS reports will be reviewed bi-weekly.	Student referrals,ISS, OSS reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention

Dropout Prevention Goal #1:

To reduce the percentage of dropouts by 2.7% and increase the percentage of graduates by 7%.

**Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*

2012 Current Dropout Rate:

2013 Expected Dropout Rate:

3.4%

0.7%

2012 Current Graduation Rate:

2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

74%

81%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.2. High number of FCAT Retakers/Adult students	1.2 Provide FCAT ReTake tutorials for FCAT ReTakers including Adult Students	1.2. Drop-Out Prevention Coordinator and Behavior Specialist	1.2.1.1. FCAT Retakers will be identified by EWS reviews and assigned to tutoring in after-school and Saturday prep class.	FCAT-retake scores

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Goal #1:

**Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*

To increase the low percentage by encouraging parents to participate in Parents workshops and Family Reading Nights.

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:

2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

35%

50%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents not attending school events	<p>Strategy</p> <p>1.1. Encourage parents to participate in Family Reading Nights and Parents Workshops.</p> <p>2. Offer monthly Reading Nights (9th Grade Academy)</p> <p>3. Every Reading teacher calls parents within first three weeks of school to discuss students performance in class</p> <p>4. Continue the School Advisory (SAC) Parent EXPO's, Grade Level Parent Night Out's and School Parent Teacher Association (PTSA)</p> <p>5. Investigate and</p>	<p>Reading Coach and Parent Liaison</p> <p>Volunteer Coordinator</p>	<p>Collect participation data and survey families</p> <p>Administration will review parent-calling logs.</p> <p>Agenda and Participation logs.</p>	<p>Parent Attendance Sign-In Sheets</p> <p>Documented sign-in data from meetings and activities.</p>

		implement the Golden School Award Program			
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. To increase the number of students participating in Level 3 STEM courses.
2. To increase the number of students that participate in science and engineering fairs.
3. To increase the number of students that compete in Regional/State science and engineering fairs.
4. To provide STEM PD for all teachers.
5. To provide PD for teachers in order to implement the integration of STEM reading and writing in study centers.
6. To provide STEM Pathway opportunities for students in feeder schools.
7. To increase partnership opportunities for STEM students.

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1.1 Lack of students meeting level	1.1 To provide knowledge and awareness of	1.1 Principal, Science Coach, Math	1.1 Workshops/Surveys 2.1	1.1 Increased student enrollment Level 3 STEM courses

<p>3 STEM courses requirements.</p> <p>2.1 Lack of student interest in participating in science and technology engineering fairs.</p> <p>3.1 Lack of student interest in science and engineering Regional/State fairs and competition.</p> <p>4.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness.</p> <p>5.1 Lack of PD and implementation strategies of teachers in order to integrate STEM reading/writing in study centers.</p> <p>6.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness of STEM Pathway opportunities to feeder school students.</p> <p>7.1 Lack of knowledge and awareness</p>	<p>STEM to FCAT Level 3 or higher students and encourage their participation in STEM courses.</p> <p>2.1 To promote and encourage science students participation in science and technology fairs.</p> <p>3.1 To promote and encourage students to participation in science and technology fairs.</p> <p>4.1 To provide faculty and staff with PD that makes them more knowledgeable and aware of STEM.</p> <p>5.1 To provide PD for teachers in order to integrate STEM reading and writing in study centers.</p> <p>6.1 To provide workshops/activities related to STEM Pathways opportunities to feeder school students.</p> <p>7.1 To provide workshops/activities related to STEM partnership opportunities for students.</p>	<p>Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director</p> <p>2.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director</p> <p>3.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director</p> <p>4.1 Principal, Science Coach, Math Coach, District RTTT Director and FLDOE STEM Specialist.</p> <p>5.1 Principal, Science Coach, Math Coach, District RTTT Director and FLDOE STEM Specialist.</p> <p>6.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director</p> <p>7.1 Principal,Science Coach, Math</p>	<p>Science/Engineering Fairs student workshops and field trips.</p> <p>3.1 Science/Engineering Fairs student workshops and field trips</p> <p>4.1 Lesson Studys.</p> <p>5.1 Observations/PLCs</p> <p>6.1 STEM Pathways workshops/Activities for feeder school students.</p> <p>7.1 STEM Partnerships opportunities workshops/Activities for students .</p>	<p>records.</p> <p>2.1 Increased number of students participating in science and engineering fairs.</p> <p>3.1 Increased number of students participating in Regional/State science and engineering fairs.</p> <p>4.1 Survey/Questionnaires</p> <p>5.1 CWTs, Formative Evaluations</p> <p>6.1 Increased number of STEM Pathways opportunities for feeder school students.</p> <p>7.1 Increased number of STEM partnership opportunities for students</p>
--	---	--	--	--

of partnership opportunities for STEM students.		Coach, Tech.Specialist, District RTTT Director, K-12 Director		
---	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. To increase the number of registered CAPE Programs.
2. To increase the number of teachers with Industry Certification.
3. To increase the number of teachers with CARPD/NGCARPD training.
4. To develop a CTE Advisory Council.

1. CTE

CTE Goal #1:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	1.1 Lack of awareness and knowledge of CAPE programs. 2.1 Number of teacher industry certification opportunities. 3.1 Lack of CARPD/NGCARPD awareness and training. 4.1 Lack of interest	1.1 To provide PD of CAPE Programs. 2.1 To provide more industry certification opportunities for teachers. 3.1 To provide CARPD/NGCARPD in-service/training for CTE teachers. 4.1 To plan and	1.1 Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist. 2.1 Principal, District's CTE Director,	1.1 In-service/Workshops 2.1 In-service/Workshops 3.1 In-service/Workshops 4.1 In-service/Workshops	1.1 Surveys/Questionnaires 2.1 Records of Industry Certified Teachers. 3.1 Records of number of CARPD/NGCARPD CTE Teachers. 4.1 Established CTE Advisory Council

and awareness of CTE Advisory Councils.	implement a CTE Advisory Council.	FLDOE Program Specialist. 4.1 Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist. Principal, District's CTE Director, FLDOE Program Specialist.		
---	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority
 Focus
 Prevent
 NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

1. To work in an advisory capacity and assist the school's administration carry-out and meet the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan.

AYP DATA

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data 2011-2012](#)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data 2010-2011](#)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data 2009-2010](#)

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Gadsden School District EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	18%	58%	67%	15%	158	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	32%	65%			97	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	40% (NO)	65% (YES)			105	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points					360	

Earned						
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					F	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Gadsden School District EAST GADSDEN HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	16%	58%	83%	13%	170	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	31%	69%			100	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	43% (NO)	67% (YES)			110	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					380	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of

						students tested
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------