

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2011-2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: MONARCH HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Mr. James Neer

SAC Chair: Ms. Jeanne Jusevic/Ms. Patricia Delmonte

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/6/2011

Last Modified on: 10/5/2011

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](#)

(Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 1 of the writing and science goals.)

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

(Use this data to complete Section 5 of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3 of the writing goals.)

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

(Use this data to inform the problem solving process when writing goals.)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Position	Name	Degree(s) / Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (High Standards, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	James Neer	BA – Special Education, Eastern Michigan University MA – Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University	3	17	2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery-43% Math Mastery-74% Writing Mastery-85% Science Mastery-26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math. 2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 47% Math Mastery – 77% Writing Mastery – 92% Science Mastery – 33% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.

Assis Principal	Christy Bradford	<p>BA – Elementary Education Florida Atlantic University</p> <p>MA – Education Leadership Florida Atlantic University</p>	4	4	<p>2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery-43% Math Mastery-74% Writing Mastery-85% Science Mastery-26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 47% Math Mastery – 77% Writing Mastery – 92% Science Mastery – 33% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Assis Principal	Marco Caceres	<p>BA – Industrial Engineering, Garcilaso University</p> <p>MS – TESOL, Nova Southeastern University</p>	9	12	<p>2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery-43% Math Mastery-74% Writing Mastery-85% Science Mastery-26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 47% Math Mastery – 77% Writing Mastery – 92% Science Mastery – 33% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Assis Principal	William Hendricks	<p>BS – Education, The Ohio State University</p> <p>MS – Education, Florida Atlantic University</p>	9	18	<p>2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery-43% Math Mastery-74% Writing Mastery-85% Science Mastery-26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 47% Math Mastery – 77% Writing Mastery – 92% Science Mastery – 33% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Assis Principal	Karleen Thompson	<p>BS – Psychology, Florida Atlantic University</p> <p>MA – Education Leadership, Florida Atlantic University</p>	2	4	<p>2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery-43% Math Mastery-74% Writing Mastery-85% Science Mastery-26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 85%</p>

Math Mastery – 87%
 Writing Mastery – 98%
 Science Mastery – 68%
 AYP: Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in both Reading and Math.

HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Reading	Gloria Moss	DEGREES- BA/English Literature, MA/English, Ph.D/Theater Education CERTIFICATIONS - Drama 6-12 English 6-12 Education Leadership (All levels) ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement	5	5	2010-2011 Grade: Reading Mastery – 43% Math Mastery – 74% Writing Mastery –85% Science Mastery – 26% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math. 2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery – 47% Math Mastery – 77% Writing Mastery – 92% Science Mastery – 33% AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners did not make AYP in Math.

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Partnering and mentoring new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff members	NESS Liaison, Leadership Team, Administration	Continual implementation of strategies throughout the school year.	
2	New teachers will attend a year long training on the New Teacher Academy to assist to facilitate effective instructional practices and interact with new professional knowledge.	Ness Liasion, Leadership Team, Administration	Continual implementation of strategies throughout the school year.	
3	Professional Learning Communities will be utilized throughout the school year addressing instruction in the Common Core State Standards.	Ness Liasion, Leadership Team, Administration	Continual implementation of strategies throughout the school year.	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
No data submitted			

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school who are teaching at least one academic course.

*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 Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
89	0.0%(0)	16.9%(15)	25.8%(23)	57.3%(51)	56.2%(50)	100.0%(89)	13.5%(12)	13.5%(12)	31.5%(28)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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
No data submitted			

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

Not Applicable

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Not Applicable

Title I, Part D

Not Applicable

Title II

Not Applicable

Title III

Not Applicable

Title X- Homeless

Not Applicable

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) funds are used to -

- 1) Provide tutoring after school in core subject areas.
- 2) APEX recovery programming and credit acceleration.
- 3) After school management and monitoring of at-risk students.
- 4) After school management and monitoring of college ready students.
- 5) After school management and monitoring of students enrolled in accelerated coursework.

Violence Prevention Programs

Not Applicable

Nutrition Programs

Not Applicable

Housing Programs

Not Applicable

Head Start

Not Applicable

Adult Education

Not Applicable

Career and Technical Education

Monarch offers a variety of career education and tech prep programs and classes. Every student who completes a Career and professional (CAPE) Academy program will 1.graduate from high school, 2.obtain one or more industry certifications, 3.be prepared to enter the workforce and proceed to higher education. The CAPE academies provide opportunities for students to compete four sequential courses within a major area of interest, promoting acceleration mechanisms, dual enrollment, articulated credit and occupational completion points.

The Career Technical Program supports Florida's economy by meeting industry needs for skilled employees in high-demand jobs. It provides a rigorous, standards-based academic, career, technical educational curriculum. Students completing must receive a high school diploma and industry certification. Opportunities to earn credit through articulation agreements and/or academic and technical dual enrollment. Participate in internships, externships and/or on the job training. Student may obtain a Bright Futures/Gold Seal Scholarship and a Ready to Work Certificate.

*Early Childhood – Students learn the basics of childhood development and working in a nursery/pre-school setting.

*Marketing OJT – Students learn the essential skills necessary to perform successfully in the work setting.

*New Media Technology

*Digital Design

*E-commerce Marketing

*Pathways to Engineering

*PC Support

*Web Design

Job Training

Not Applicable

Other

Not Applicable

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Principal- Mr. James Neer

Assistant Principals – Ms. Christy Bradford, Mr. Marco Caceres, Mr. Will Hendricks, Ms. Karleen Thompson-

School administrators provide a common vision for the use of data-based, decision-making, ensuring that the school-based team is 1)implementing RtI support,2)conducting on-going assessment of RtI skills of school staff, 3)documenting and providing quality professional development to support RtI implementation, 4) Ensuring continuous communication with all

stakeholders, supporting and modeling the RtI process at Monarch.

TIER 1 interventions are evaluated by the Comprehensive Problem Solving Team (CPST) in the areas of reading, math, writing, science and behavior. This data is utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of curricular instruction and classroom management. Monarch High School utilizes a school-wide approach to behavior management through the school Discipline Plan. The Data from the TIER 1 interventions is also used to screen and identify at-risk students whose data indicates further TIER 2 or 3 interventions are needed.

Math Department Chair, Ms. Deborah Demby, Science Department Chair, Ms. Nicole Cimoch-

The Math and Science RtI Leadership Team develops, leads, and evaluates core content standards and instructional programs, while identifying and analyzing existing literature on data based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.

Identifying systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to determine appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Department Heads assist with whole school screening programs that provide interventions for children to be considered "at risk;" assisting in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis.

Language Arts Department Chair – Ms. Christine Donahue, Reading Coach – Dr. Gloria Moss, Reading Department Chair – Ms. Barbara Lavker

The Reading and Language Arts RtI Leadership Team provide guidance on grades 9-12 reading and writing plan, while facilitating and supporting data collection activities. Assisting in data analysis while providing professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning. Implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions are implemented throughout the Reading/Language Arts instruction.

ESE Department Chair, Ms. Christine Lamb, Speech/Language Pathologist, Ms. Wendy Michaels, ESE Specialist, Ms. Sellitti-

The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) RtI Leadership Team participates in student data collection, integrating core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborating with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching and support facilitation.

Health/Wellness Department Chair, Ms. Pamela Griffin, Foreign Language Department Chair, Ms. Nicole Deman, Social Studies Department Chair, Mr. Andrew Rumpfeldt, Fine Arts Department Chair, Ms. Ann Ayers-

The elective subject area RtI Leadership Team provides information regarding elective instruction while participating in student data collection. Delivering Tier 1 instruction/interventions, collaborating with staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrating Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Career/Technology Education Department Chair, Ms. Lori Fuller-

The Technology RtI Leadership Team utilizes technology necessary to manage and display data, providing professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data analysis.

Social Worker, Ms. Rhonda Terpak, Family Counselor, Dr. Ralph Levinson,

Student Services Itinerant Personnel provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students The school social worker links community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist, Ms. Jean Reynolds

The school psychologist participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitating development of intervention plans. Supporting the faculty in professional development, technical assistance in intervention development, and data based decision.

Guidance Director, Mr. Tom Weber, Guidance Counselors – Mr. William McIntyre, Ms. Reina Lucas, Ms. Perla Moses

The Guidance department coordinates and conducts the CPST in the RtI process throughout the school year. Providing educational data to ensure proper recommendation and placement and providing support to the faculty and staff in recommended interventions.

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

The CPST is coordinated and facilitated by the Guidance Director. Each student who's data is brought to the CPST is case managed by the student's guidance counselor. The CPST meets twice a month to engage in data review and analysis, monitoring and analyzing student progress data to determine and recommend appropriate interventions. The RtI Team reviews student data and implements supports for instructional decisions with appropriate faculty and staff. Student progress is reviewed for each grade level, identifying students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, or students at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources to address the concerns for the lack of student progress. The RtI team will also collaborate regularly to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation of interventions, make on going decisions through the RtI process, and practice new processes and skills for progress maintenance. The RtI team will facilitate the process of building consensus and making decisions regarding implementation throughout the school.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI 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 Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help determine the school's need in the development of goals for the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The RtI Team provided data on Tier 1,2,3 interventions and on the school's Professional Development activities regarding training the faculty on instruction aligned with the processes and procedures of RtI.

RtI Implementation

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

Baseline Data: 1) Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), 2) Broward Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math, and science, and writing) 3)Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 4)Discipline Management System (DMS), AS400 (TERMS)-attendance, grades, out of school assessments.

Progress Monitoring: 1) PMRN, Mini assessments 2) Midyear – Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) 3) End of Year – FAIR, FCAT 4) Frequency of Data Days – twice a month for data analysis 5)Attendance, ACT, SAT, CPT, Writing Prompts, Review of Tier 1 & Tier 2 Intervention Data Forms & Graphs.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

The School Psychologist and Guidance Counselors will train the Leadership team on how to assist the faculty in their continuing efforts to implement RtI interventions in the classroom setting. The Guidance Department and School Psychologist delivered an RtI training during the pre-planning week for the School Leadership Team, composed of administration, guidance counselors, department heads, instructional coaches, and the ESE Specialist. The specific content of the RtI training included: 1) review of student referral to the CPST for the implementation of the RtI process 2)review Tier 1, 2 & 3 of the RtI process, 3)review specific responsibilities, procedures and timelines in student data collection.

The School Leadership Team, the CPST Team will continue to train and monitor on the understanding, development and implementation of RtI interventions in Professional Learning Communities throughout the school year.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Mr. James Neer-Principal
Ms. Christy Bradford-Assistant Principal
Mr. Marco Caceres- Assistant Principal
Dr. Gloria Moss – Reading Coach and Literacy Team Facilitator
Ms. Christine Donahue – Language Arts Department Head
Ms. Nicole Cimoch - Science Department Head
Ms. Nicole DeMan-Foreign Language Department Head

Ms. Barbara Lavker-Reading Department Head
Ms. Lori Fuller- Career Technology Department Head
Ms. Pamela Griffin –Health and Physical Education
Ms. Ann Ayers – Fine Arts Department Head
Ms. Christine Lamb - ESE Department Head
Mr. Andy Ruplefeldt – Social Studies Department Head
Ms. Lenora Smoot – Media Center

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

The Monarch Literacy Leadership Team functions in three phases;

Phase 1) Supply literacy materials for teachers in all of the content areas. The Literacy Plan focusing on higher order thinking, will be implemented and evident throughout all classrooms this year.

Phase 2)The Literacy Leadership Team will meet on monthly on a Wiki established for the purpose of collegial communication and sharing of ideas and materials. Each member will be responsible for exchanging ideas, methods and information with their department through department meetings, PLCs, and providing feedback via the Wiki comments section.

Departmental monthly instructional agendas, school-wide activities and “to-do” lists,all pertaining to higher order thinking skills, reading and thinking activities, content area resources, lesson study and learning. Graphics organizers will be utilized, which will include student generated summaries and higher order thinking questions to analyze the information.

Phase 3) Teachers will collect, evaluate and display student samples of work to assess and evaluate if progress has been made for student higher order thinking skills.

All LLT phases will be monitored by the Administration and the School Leadership Team to ensure fidelity in the process.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this school year will be to improve the planning and implementation in the classroom of higher order reading and thinking activities, lesson study and consideration of learning styles across the content areas. The accountability plan will include; collect samples of student work that demonstrate the use of identified higher order strategies in all content areas. Student performance will be evaluated utilizing the BAT testing, FCAT score (focusing on reference and research), accelerated course exams, college readiness tests and end of year exams. Teachers will follow the Monarch High School Instructional Focus calendar.

All teachers are encouraged to obtain a reading endorsement. Courses on Broward Virtual Education as well as through district secondary reading are promoted by the LLT.

The Reading Coach will mentor and train all teachers who enroll for on-line reading courses in preparation for taking CAR-PD, assisting with lesson planning and completing classroom observations throughout the school year.

NCLB Public School Choice

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status

No Attachment

Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification

No Attachment

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status

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.

Not Applicable

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All instructional staff have been trained on utilizing Marzano's 9 High Yield Strategies, Content area teachers have been trained to use reading strategies, 10% of teachers are reading endorsed.

*High Schools Only

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

Monarch offers a wide variety of Career Technical Education classes. Each class completes activities geared toward career exploration and field trips are also a part of the curriculum. Other elective classes also offer opportunities for career exploration, including Sports and Recreation Management. 9th graders are introduced to various careers and complete a Job Exploration Project.

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?

Monarch H.S. implements the Annual Guidance Plan (AGP), focusing on academic and career planning, in this plan each student will meet with their guidance counselor to discuss academic and career planning, select courses, and discuss post-secondary options. The website FACTS.org will be utilized for academic and career planning research. Students are also required to complete and reevaluate their ePEP each year beginning with this year's 9th grade.

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 School Feedback Report

Monarch H.S. offers courses on math and reading for college readiness to prepare students for postsecondary education or employment opportunities. The guidance department, administrators, the BRACE advisor and Advanced Placement teachers will meet with students to increase enrollment in accelerated courses. A college informational night will be held to inform and assist parents and students on the entire college application process, including the importance of accelerated courses for college readiness.

The Guidance Counselors will incorporate a variety of strategies to improve postsecondary readiness by : 1) maximize the use of fee waivers for the SAT/ACT/College admissions for eligible students, 2) administer the PSAT to all 10th grade students, 3) 11th grade students will have a field trip to the Junior Experience at the College Fair. Juniors who are not able to attend this field trip will be encouraged to attend the evening College Fair.

Finally, the school BRACE advisor will collect post secondary data throughout the year in BRACE track.

We will encourage students to take Advance Placement courses.

We will have the guidance counselors meet on a regular basis with students to discuss postsecondary plans. This will include information and requirements to be eligible for Bright Futures.

The Leadership team will review charts tracking graduation requirements and intervene as necessary.

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:

1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading Reading Goal #1:	31%(279) of students will achieve mastery on the 2011/2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
26%(237) achieved proficiency FCAT Reading.	31%(279)will achieve proficiency 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	Student lack of proficiency in Higher Order Thinking skills that inhibits achievement on standardized assessments.	Emphasis on instructional planning of higher order/critical thinking questioning throughout all content areas. Strategies to infuse higher order thinking in all instruction will be the primary focus of the PLC, collaborative lesson planning and LLT.	Administration, Leadership Team	Analysis of trend data gathered from CWT through out the school year. The Leadership Team will meet and review CWT data twice monthly prioritizing data with an emphasis on instructional and focus. Teacher feedback will be provided by the Leadership Team through Data Chats, targeting groups to provide specific data to create an effective plan of action to implement resultant lessons. Teachers will also review individual student data twice quarterly and review with each students through a school wide Data Chat day for all teachers, in each classroom.	Specific analysis of CWT strategy in lesson implementation, BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments for each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT/SAT assessment scores
2	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development ACADEMIC WORKSHOP before and after school to tutor individual students Collaborative lesson	Reading Coach Administration and Department chair persons	Evaluation of student work Lesson Study and PLC activities	BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5. FCAT scores

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 achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading Reading Goal #2:	22%(198) of students will achieve mastery (level 4 & 5) on the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
17%(153) of students achieved level 4 & 5 FCAT Reading Assessment.	22%(198) of students will achieve level 4 & 5 FCAT Assessment.

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	Decreased motivation to improve performance of students who have met proficiency on standardized assessments.	Increase rigor in planning and implementation of core curriculum to ensure continuous improvement of college ready skills. Increase rigor in planning and implementation of IFC benchmarks with a concentration in higher order thinking skills.	Administration, Leadership Team, Guidance Counselors	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
2	Limited planning for remediation and maintenance of skills where proficiency has been achieved.	Continual review of lesson planning and instruction to ensure all level 4 & 5 skill levels are being maintained and improved within all core content benchmarks.	Administration, Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
3	Limited knowledge of educational requirements for college readiness and post secondary employability skills needed for success in the workforce.	Through out the school year student will participate in Data Chats with their teachers regarding their academic standing in their individual classes. The students will also receive training in the academic requirements for college acceptance, vocational training	Administration, Leadership Team, Guidance Counselors, BRACE Advisors, Teachers, Instructional Coaches	Analysis of student and school data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in

	entrance requirements and work skill requirements in reading, math and writing.		accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading Reading Goal #3:	51%(480) of students will make learning gains on the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
48% students(452)achieved learning gains on the 2010/2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.	51% students (480) will achieve learning gains on 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of proficiency in Higher Order Thinking skills that inhibits achievement on standardized assessments.	Emphasis on instructional planning of higher order/critical thinking questioning throughout all content areas. Strategies to infuse higher order thinking in all instruction will be the primary focus of the PLC, collaborative lesson planning and LLT.	Administration, Leadership Team	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	
2	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests.	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development.	Administration, Department Head, Reading Coach	Evaluation of student work Lesson Study and PLC activities	BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5 Mini BAT Testing FCAT scores FAIR Testing Progress monitoring

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. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading Reading Goal #4:	56%(136) of lowest quartile of students will make learning gains on the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
53%(129) lowest quartile of students made learning gains on 2010/2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.	56%(136) lowest quartile of students will make learning gains on 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests. Students lack proficiency in context clues and overall reading comprehension.	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development and Student Data Chats.	Administration, Department Head	Evaluation of student work Lesson Study and PLC activities FAIR testing and monitoring Mini BAT testing and remediation	BAT testing of all students, levels 1-5. FAIR testing Progress Monitoring Mini BAT testing and remediation FCAT scores

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

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5A:	Students in the subgroup(s) ethnicity will increase overall (Annual Yearly Progress)AYP by White-53%(215), Black-38%(63), Hispanic-45%(150), Asian-54%(24), American Indian-28%(2).
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *

2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

White-47%(407), Black-31%(52), Hispanic-38%(127), Asian-48%(22), American Indian-20%(1)

White-53%(215), Black-38%(63), Hispanic-45%(150), Asian-54%(24), American Indian-28%(2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests. Varied student learning styles and ability leading to lack of engagement and motivation.	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development. Evaluation of learning styles by all content area teachers and implementation of strategies to address those varied styles. Recommended accommodations	Reading Coach Administration and Department chair persons.	Evaluation of student work Lesson Study and PLC activities Mini BAT Testing FAIR Testing and monitoring	BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5 FCAT scores FAIR Testing and monitoring

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 not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5B:	28% of ELL students (22) will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) on the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
20% of ELL students(17)achieved AYP on the 2010/2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.			28% of ELL students(22) will achieve AYP on 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.		
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	<p>Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests</p> <p>Students' lack of academic vocabulary in English. (CALP)</p>	<p>Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development.</p> <p>Strategies for work on multi-syllabic words and word affixes.</p> <p>Recommended accommodations</p> <p>A1&A2 language classification reading needs will be met within a sheltered instructional environment.</p>	Reading Coach Administration, Department Head	<p>Evaluation of student work</p> <p>Lesson Study and PLC activities</p> <p>Mini Bat Testing</p> <p>FAIR Testing and progress monitoring</p>	<p>BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5</p> <p>FCAT scores</p> <p>FAIR Testing and monitoring</p> <p>CELLA Testing</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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading	31%(24) of SWD students will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) on the 2011/2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Assessment.
Reading Goal #5C:	

Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *		2012 Expected Level of Performance: *	
23%(18) of SWD students achieved AYP on the 2010/2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.		31%(24) of SWD students will achieve AYP on the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level	Reading Coach Administration and Department Head, ESE Support Teacher	<p>Evaluation of student work.</p> <p>Lesson Study and PLC activities.</p> <p>IEP Progress Report</p>	<p>BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5</p> <p>FCAT scores</p> <p>BAT TESTING of all students,</p>

1	standardized tests. Varied student learning styles and ability leading to lack of engagement and motivation.	professional development. Evaluation of learning styles by all content area teachers and implementation of strategies to address those varied styles. Recommended accommodations			levels 1-5 FCAT scores
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5D:	42%(204) of Economically Disadvantaged students will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) on the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
35%(171) of Economically Disadvantaged students achieved AYP on the 2010/2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.	42%(204) Economically Disadvantaged students will achieve AYP on the 2011/2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of proficiency in higher order thinking that causes poor performance in the reference and research questions on standardized tests. Varied student learning styles and ability leading to lack of engagement and motivation.	Introduction of strategies for teaching higher order/critical thinking throughout the content areas via Literacy Team, PLC and department level professional development. Evaluation of learning styles by all content area teachers and implementation of strategies to address those varied styles. Recommended accommodations	Administrator, Guidance Director, Dept. Head, Reading Coach	Evaluation of student work Lesson Study and PLC activities FAIR Testing and progress monitoring Mini BAT Test	BAT TESTING of all students, levels 1-5 FCAT scores FAIR Testing and progress monitoring

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	Target Dates and	
--	--	--	----	------------------	--

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AYP/School Grades	9-12 all subjects	Teacher Development/HRD	school-wide	8/18/10 planning day(3 hour training)	Additional training in Differentiated Instruction in for all grades in September 2010	School Administrators
Professional Development focus - "Unwrapping the Benchmarks" (in depth lesson study school wide and by department.	9-12 all subjects	Leadership Team, Reading Dept. Head	Reading Teachers, ESE Teachers	School Wide Professional Development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work portfolios, departmental in depth lesson studies	Leadership Team, Reading Coach, Reading Teachers
Professional Development focus- Common Core State Standards to enhance FCAT 2.0 instruction, as well as increase Differentiated Instruction for student college and career readiness.	9-12 all subjects	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches	school-wide	School Wide Professional Development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work portfolios, departmental in depth lesson studies	Leadership Team, Instructional Coaches, Reading Teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To offer before and after school tutoring to address reinforcement of benchmarks across disciplines	Released test items; core curriculum texts	SAC	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teen Biz	Differentiated Reading instruction focusing on benchmarks and state standards.	Perkins Grant Accountability	\$16,000.00
			Subtotal: \$16,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$19,000.00

Mathematics 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 achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #1:	37%(172) of students will achieve a level 3 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment and EOC proficiency.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
32%(149) of students achieved a level 3 on the 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessment and EOC proficiency.	37%(172) of students will achieve a level 3 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment and EOC proficiency.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student lack of proficiency in Higher Order Thinking skills that inhibits achievement on standardized assessments.	Emphasis on instructional planning of higher order/critical thinking questioning throughout all content areas. Strategies to infuse higher order thinking in all instruction will be the primary focus of the PLC, collaborative lesson planning and LLT.	Administration, Leadership Team	Analysis of trend data gathered from CWT through out the school year. The Leadership Team will meet and review CWT data twice monthly prioritizing data with an emphasis on instructional and focus. Teacher feedback will be provided by the Leadership Team through Data Chats, targeting groups to provide specific data to create an effective plan of action to implement resultant lessons. Teachers will also review individual student data twice quarterly and review with each students through a school wide Data Chat day for all teachers, in each classroom.	Specific analysis of CWT strategy in lesson implementation, BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments for each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT/SAT assessment scores
2	Algebraic thinking and measurement	Teacher supervised after school peer program will be implemented 2 times a week. (This will address FCAT and college readiness for students with a low gpa) and EOC proficiency. 10 day push/ crunch time plan Offer Pre Algebra remedial classes (level 1-9th grade)	Administrator, Math Department Head	Analysis of Classroom Walkthrough with monthly Data Chat with teachers and students, FCAT scores, course grade, Pre-Test, progress Test and Post Test, EOC scores	BAT TEST scores, FCAT classes, FCAT test, Mid-term exams & Final Exams, EOC scores

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 achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #2:	45%(209) of students will achieve mastery (level 4 & 5) on the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment and EOC Proficiency.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
42%(195) of students achieved a level 4 & 5 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics and EOC proficiency.	45%(209)of students will achieve a level 4 & 5 on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics and EOC proficiency.

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	Decreased motivation to improve performance of students who have met proficiency on standardized assessments.	Increase rigor in planning and implementation of core curriculum to ensure continuous improvement of college ready skills. Increase rigor in planning and implementation of IFC benchmarks with a concentration in higher order thinking skills.	Administration, Leadership Team, Guidance Counselors	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
2	Limited planning for remediation and maintenance of skills where proficiency has been achieved.	Continual review of lesson planning and instruction to ensure all level 4 & 5 skill levels are being maintained and improved within all core content benchmarks.	Administration, Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
3	Student complacency to improve FCAT performance and EOC performance	Increase awareness for college readiness and post secondary opportunities. In house training to classroom teacher for SAT/ACT Daily warm up (mini assessment) for algebra2 or higher classes.	Administrator, Math Department Head	AP scores, SAT/ACT/CPT scores, Classroom Walkthroughs	Scores on AP SAT/ACT/CPT scores

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. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #3:	75%(372)of students will make learning gains on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
72%(356) of students achieved a learning gain on the 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessment .	75%(372) of students will make learning gains on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance	Parent communication will be increased through SAC/SAF/PTSA. Participation grades,utilizing CPST Team and guidance. After school tutoring	Administartor, Math Department Head, assistant principal, Social Worker, CPST Team	Teacher initiated communication with student's parent. Data Chat with administrators, Student conference, BAT and FCAT scores, Attendance Reports	Mini- BAT, BAT, FCAT, EOC, Teacher Assessment Test

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. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #4:	63%(79) of students who are among the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
60%(75) of students who are among the lowest quartile achieved learning gains on the 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	63%(79) of students who are among the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance	Parent communication and participation grades, CPST Team	Assistant Principal	Student/Teacher & Parent data chat utilizing BAT and FCAT scores. Parent conferencing with administrator, guidance and teachers.	BAT and FCAT, monitor grades/discipline /attendance through virtual counselor.
2	Student Motivation	Instructional Focus Calendar will be written for specific math courses to drive the curriculum for student learning gains.	Department Head, Assistant Principal	Mini assessment, Monthly student conference through teacher data chat with focus on grades, discipline and attendance and PLC.	Teacher made test,BAT, and FCAT, student grade/attendance/discipline data utilizing Virtual Counselor.

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

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5A:	Students in the following subgroups-ethnicity will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) by increasing math scores by White-80%(156),Black-63%(55),Hispanic-72%(129),Asian-92%(24),American Indian-78%(4).
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
White-77%(150),Black-58%(51),Hispanic-68%(123),Asian-92%(24), American Indian-75%(3)	White-80%(156),Black-63%(55), Hispanic-72%(129), Asian-92%(24), American Indian-78%(4).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance	Parent communication and participation grades, CPST Team	Administrators, Math Dept. Head., Teachers	BAT and FCAT scores	Mini-BATS, BAT, FCAT, Teacher Assessment Tests

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

5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5B:	62%(27) of students who are classified in the subgroup ELL will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
57%(25) ELL of students who are classified in the subgroup ELL achieved AYP on the 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	62%(27) ELL students who are clasified in the subgroup ELL will achieve AYP on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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	Low student attendance Limited english proficiency	Parent communication through letter home in multiple languages. Participation grades Classroom teachers will utilize ESOL strategies utilizing Differentiated Instruction.	Administrator	CWT, Student feedback and Student Portfolio	Mini BATS, Bat, FCAT, Teacher Assessment Test

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5C:	49%(23)of students who are classified in the subgroup ESE will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) Proficiency 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
43%(20) of students who are classified SWD achieved AYP Proficiency 2010/2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.			49%(23)of students who are classified SWD will achieve AYP Proficiency 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.		
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	Maintaining grade level standards	Understanding and compliance with IEP Utilize ESE resource teacher in instruction. Parent Communication	Department Head, Administrator, Teachers ESE resource teacher	BAT and FCAT scores IEP progress report	BAT,FCAT and IEP, Teacher Assessment Test

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5D:	69%(176) of students classified Economically Disadvantaged will achieve Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
65%(167) Economically Disadvantaged scored proficient on the 2010/2011 on the FCAT Mathematics Assessment.			69%(176) Economically Disadvantaged will score proficient on the 2011/2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance	Parent communication and participation grades CPST Team/Rtl	Department Head, Administrator, classroom teacher, assistant principal	BAT and FCAT scores	Mini BATS, BAT, FCAT, Teacher Assessment Test

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AYP/School Grades	9-12 all subjects	Teacher Development/HRD	school-wide	planning day (3 hour training)	Additional training in Differentiated Instruction for all grades/subjects	School Administrators
Professional Development focus- "Unwrapping the Benchmarks"(in depth lesson study school wide and by department)	9-12 all subjects	Leadership Team,Math Dept. Head Math Coach	Math Dept.	School wide professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership team, Math Dept. Head, Math Teachers
Professional Development focus- Common Core State Standards to enhance FCAT 2.0 instruction, as well as increase Differentiated Instruction for student college and career readiness.	9-12 all subjects	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches	school-wide	School wide professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches,
Monthly meeting with Mathematics department to review new Benchmark standards and conduct lesson study on individual strands.	9-12 all subjects	Math Department, Assistant Principal	Math Department	School wide professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches,

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
Peer tutoring program	teacher supplement	accountability fund	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00

Science 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 achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science Science Goal # 1:		Students will meet or exceed the state average percentage on the Science EOC .			
2011 Current Level of Performance: *		2012 Expected Level of Performance: *			
25%(98) of students scored proficient on the 2010/2011 Science FCAT Assessment.		Students will meet or exceed the state average percentage on the Science 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	Student lack of proficiency in Higher Order Thinking skills that inhibits achievement on standardized assessments.	Emphasis on instructional planning of higher order/critical thinking questioning throughout all content areas. Strategies to infuse higher order thinking in all instruction will be the primary focus of the PLC, collaborative lesson planning and LLT.	Administration, Leadership Team	Analysis of trend data gathered from CWT through out the school year. The Leadership Team will meet and review CWT data twice monthly prioritizing data with an emphasis on instructional and focus. Teacher feedback will be provided by the Leadership Team through Data Chats, targeting groups to provide specific data to create an effective plan of action to implement resultant lessons. Teachers will also review individual student data twice quarterly and review with each students through a school wide Data Chat day for all teachers, in each classroom.	Specific analysis of CWT strategy in lesson implementation, BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments for each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT/SAT assessment scores
2	Science student lack exposure to science standards presented on Science Assessment. Therefore, have done poorly on these science benchmarks where instruction has not been provided.	Teachers will fully understand and instruct to the new standards, teachers will attend science focused professional development throughout the school year. Biology department will attend professional development opportunities in unwrapping standards. Weekly review of all annually assessed FCAT	Assistant Principal, Dept. Head, Science Teachers	Student inquiry Hands On Laboratory Experiments Teacher Demonstrations	Weekly essential questions BAT data ESE performance evaluations through development of portfolios.

	Science benchmarks. Instructional Focus Calendar subject area concentration to address lack of exposure to benchmarks.		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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 achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science Science Goal #2:	7%(27) of students will score proficient on the Science EOC .
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
2%(6)of students scored a level 4 & 5 on the Science FCAT.	7%(27) of students will score proficient on the Science 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	Decreased motivation to improve performance of students who have met proficiency on standardized assessments.	Increase rigor in planning and implementation of core curriculum to ensure continuous improvement of college ready skills. Increase rigor in planning and implementation of IFC benchmarks with a concentration in higher order thinking skills.	Administration, Leadership Team, Guidance Counselors	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
2	Limited planning for remediation and maintenance of skills where proficiency has been achieved.	Continual review of lesson planning and instruction to ensure all level 4 & 5 skill levels are being maintained and improved within all core content benchmarks.	Administration, Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher	Analysis of student data through out the school year.	BAT Testing, Standardized Assessments specific to each content area, FCAT Scores, End of Course Exams, grade point average, increased participation and performance in accelerated courses (Honors/AP/Dual Enrollment), CPT/ACT SAT assessment scores.
	Unfamiliarity with new chemistry standards.	Teachers will fully understand and instruct to the new standards, teachers will attend	Assistant Principal, Dept. Head, Science	Student inquiry Hands On Laboratory Experiments	Weekly essential questions BAT data

3	science focused professional development through out the school year. Chemistry department will attend professional development opportunities in unwrapping standards. Weekly review of all annually assessed FCAT Science benchmarks. Instructional Focus Calendar subject area concentration to address lack of exposure to benchmarks.	Teachers, classroom walk-throughs, lesson studies, or department chats	Teacher Demonstrations	ESE performance evaluations through development of portfolios.
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Development focus- "Unwrapping the Benchmarks" (in depth lesson study school wide and by department.	9-12/Science	Leadership Team, Science Dept. Head, Science Coach	Science Department	School Wide professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Science Dept. Head, Science Teachers
Professional Development focus- Common Core State Standards to enhance FCAT 2.0 instruction and EOC mastery, as well as increase Differentiated Instruction for student college and career readiness.	9-12 all subjects	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches	school-wide	School Wide professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, Professional collaboration and planning, Student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide students with hands on materials and state approved publications to increase student comprehension and mastery of the new science benchmarks and EOCs.	A variety of state approved laboratory and published materials for science instruction.	FTE	\$2,114.50

			Subtotal: \$2,114.50
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Vernierware in lab	Using computer software (Vernierware) for labs		\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Explorer	Using FCAT explorer to review benchmarks		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science trip to Planetarium for juniors	Planetarium at Broward College in Davie		\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
			Grand Total: \$3,514.50

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing Writing Goal #1:	On the administration of the FCAT Writing Assessment, 90% (425) of the students in 10th grade will score level 4.0 on the FCAT Writing Assessment.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
85%(405) scored a level 4 or above on the 2010/2011 FCAT Writing Assessment.	90%(425) will score a level 4 or above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.

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	Incorporating effective writing strategies in daily lessons of Language Arts classes. Editing for language conventions, revising for quality details and use of relevant, logical, plausible support as part of instruction.	Students will use the writing process daily following the Broward County Instructional Focus Calendar; all writing will be dated, and recorded on the district writing database monitoring growth across time.	Language Arts Dept. Head, administrator	Administration will monitor revision and editing process by reviewing student drafts.	Twice monthly monitoring of student data between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt.
2	Based on the 2010/2011 FCAT Writes data, 15% students scored below proficiency.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts.	Language Arts Dept. Head, Administrator	Administration will monitor revision and editing process by reviewing student drafts.	Twice monthly monitoring of student data between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt.

3	Identifying student writing weaknesses and providing appropriate remediation.	The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts.	Language Arts Dept. Head, administrator	Administration will monitor revision and editing process by reviewing student drafts.	Twice monthly monitoring of student data between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt.
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2A:	On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writes Assessment, the following subgroups will score proficient- White- 100%(201), Black- 100%(86), Hispanic- 99%(186), Asian- 98%(26), American Indian- 100%(4)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Writing Goal #2A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

The following subgroups scored proficient on the 2010/2011 FCAT Writes, White- 99%(198), Black- 99% (85), Hispanic- 97%(183), Asian- 96%(25), American Indian- 100%(4)	The following subgroups will score proficient on the 2011/2012 FCAT Writes, White- 100%(201), Black- 100% (86), Hispanic- 99%(186), Asian- 98%(26), American Indian- 100%(4)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack sufficient academic vocabulary in English to score at proficiency level for FCAT Writes.	Increased emphasis on the acquisition of academic vocabulary, using a variety of ESOL strategies. Students will use the writing process daily utilizing the Instructional Focus calendar. All scored writing prompts will be dated and recorded in a writing database to monitor growth.	School Administrator, Language Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach, ESOL Language Arts teacher	Monitor writing database twice monthly, writing BATs, classroom grades, Teacher feedback with administrator and instructional coach from data gathered from CWT, instructional focus on writing process.	FCAT Writing Rubric. Six Traits, graphic organizer for outlining, webbing, Frayer model

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2B:	On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, students in the subgroup listed as ELL will score 95%(48) ELL proficient on FCAT Writes Assessment.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

On the administration of the 2010/2011 FCAT Writing Assessment, the students in the subgroup listed as ELL scored 92%(45) ELL proficient on FCAT Writes Assessment.	On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, students in the subgroup listed as ELL will score 95%(48) ELL proficient on FCAT Writes Assessment.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack sufficient academic vocabulary in English to score at proficiency level for FCAT Writes.	Students will use the writing process daily utilizing the Instructional Focus Calendar. All scored writing prompts will be dated and recorded in a writing database to monitor growth.	School Administrator, Language Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach	Monitor writing database twice monthly, writing BATs, classroom grades, Teacher feedback with administrator and instructional coach from data gathered from CWT, instructional focus on writing process.	FCAT Writing Rubric. Six Traits, graphic organizer for outlining, webbing, Frayer model

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C:	On the administration of the FCAT Writing Test, students in the subgroup listed as SWD will increase overall writing scores by 2%(1).
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *

2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

On the administration of the 2010/2011 FCAT Writing Assessment, proficient students in the subgroup listed as SWD 90%(36).

On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, students in the subgroup listed as SWD will increase overall writing proficiency scores 93%(38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's specialized educational needs may prohibit SWD students from achieving proficiency on FCAT Writes.	Students will use the writing process daily utilizing the Instructional Focus Calendar. All scored writing prompts will be dated and recorded in a writing database to monitor growth. Direct instruction in the writing process through the Learning Strategies class. ESE Support Teacher will reinforce writing strategies. Supplemental instruction will be provided through the Rewards Writing Program. IEP will address instruction and remediation of writing process, if area of weakness.	School Administrator, Language Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach, ESE Support Teacher	Support Facilitator will monitor student writing database twice monthly, writing BATs, classroom grades, Teacher feedback with administrator and instructional coach from data gathered from CWT, instructional focus on writing process.	FCAT Writes Rubric, IEP goals, Support Facilitation Portfolio,

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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D:		On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, the students in the subgroup listed as Economically Disadvantaged will increase overall writing proficiency 99% (258).			
Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
On the administration of the 2010/2011 FCAT Writing Assessment, the students in the subgroup listed as Economically Disadvantaged scoring proficient 97% (254).			On the administration of the 2011/2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, the students in the subgroup listed as Economically Disadvantaged will increase overall writing proficiency 99% (258).		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited writing instruction in the Language Arts classroom. Student is not proficient writing on grade level.	Students will use the writing process daily utilizing the Instructional Focus Calendar. All scored writing prompts will be dated and recorded in a writing database to monitor growth.	School Administrator, Language Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach	Monitor writing database	FCAT Writing Rubric

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 and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Development focus- "Unwrapping the Benchmarks"(in depth lesson study school wide and by departments).	9-12/Language Arts	Leadership Team, Language Arts Department Head, Writing Coach	Language Arts Teachers	School Wide Professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, professional collaboration and planning, student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Lang. Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach, Language Arts Teachers
Language Arts teachers will meet monthly to review and analyze the FCAT Anchor Prompts to determine accurate use of the scoring of student monthly writing prompts.	9-12/Language Arts	Leadership Team, Language Arts Department Head, Writing Coach	Language Arts Teachers	School Wide Professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, professional collaboration and planning, student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	Leadership Team, Lang. Arts Dept. Head, Writing Coach, Language Arts Teachers
Language Arts Departmental						

monthly meeting to review FCAT Anchor Writing Prompts to assure adherence to FCAT Writes rubric when scoring monthly prompts.	9-10/Language Arts	Language Arts Department Head, Writing Coach	Language Arts Teachers	School Wide Professional development throughout the school year.	Lesson Study, professional collaboration and planning, student work port folios, departmental in depth lesson studies.	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Overall expected student attendance data for 2011/2012 will improve by 5%- attendance rate-95% (1952) excessive absences-57% (1171) excessive tardies-2%(41)
2011 Current Attendance Rate: *	2012 Expected Attendance Rate: *
2010/2011 attendance rate-90.7% (1870) 2010/2011 excessive absences-62% (1288) 2010/2011 excessive tardies-7%(145)	Overall expected student attendance data for 2011/2012 will improve by 5%- attendance rate-95% (1952) excessive absences-57% (1171) excessive tardies-2%(41)
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
1367	1298

2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
146	139

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited follow up on students with attendance issues.	<p>Establish an Attendance Committee to review and monitor students with attendance issues.</p> <p>Utilize parent link</p> <p>Teacher reinforcement of discipline plan regarding attendance policy (student point system implemented in discipline plan with rewards/consequences)</p> <p>Increase parent/teacher/student communication.</p>	Assistant Principal School Social, CPST, Guidance Dept., CPST, Leadership Team	<p>Check average daily attendance reports</p> <p>CPST and Discipline Committee Members and leadership Team will monitor highest student offenders and have a monthly conference with parents and students</p> <p>Utilization of RtI interventions (Tier 1, 2, 3) when data indicates level of intervention needed</p>	Attendance Reports, grades, teacher progress reports, grade point average, assessment data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (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		The overall number of suspensions will decrease by 5% through the utilization of the the CPST, Core Team, RTI processes and PLCs, including increased communication with parents, teachers and students.			
Suspension Goal #1:					
2011 Total Number of In –School Suspensions		2012 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions			
562		534			
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In School		2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In School			
267		254			
2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
36		34			
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out of School		2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out of School			
28		26			
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	Tardiness and Attendance	Implementation of Attendance Comprehensive Problem Solving Committee to increase parent/student/school communication.	Discipline Committee, Administration, Leadership Team, CPST, Teachers	Discipline Management System Discipline Reports	Data from monitoring the Discipline Reports
	School Rules Violations (Cell phone violation,	Implementation of school discipline plan.	Discipline Committee,	Discipline Management System	Data from monitoring the

2	skipping, dress code violation, etc.)	Utilizing reward/consequence point system for positive behavior management.	Administration, Leadership Team, CPST, Teachers	Discipline Reports	Discipline Reports
3	Behavior Management in the classroom	Utilization of RtI process.	Discipline Committee, Administration, Leadership Team, CPST, Teachers	Implementation of RtI process-data sheets, RtI data charts, continuous RtI training for faculty	RtI data forms, RtI charts, CPST recommended interventions

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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
RtI - Tier 1, 2, & 3 Training	9-12 all subjects	CPST, PLC Facilitators, Assistant Principals	school faculty and staff	throughout the school year, PLC dates	Monitor Discipline data	Assistant Principals
CHAMPS classroom management training	9-12 all subjects	HRD, Assistant Principals, Department Heads	school faculty (as needed)	throughout the school year	Monitor teacher/student individual discipline/attendance/academic data	Assistant Principals

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:		The dropout rate will decrease by 2% and the graduation rate will increase by 2%.			
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2009-2010 school year.					
2011 Current Dropout Rate: *		2012 Expected Dropout Rate: *			
.4%		.2%			
2011 Current Graduation Rate: *		2012 Expected Graduation Rate: *			
90%		92%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student with deficient credits and grade point average to meet graduation criteria.	Credit recovery program during school and after school	Administrator, Guidance Director Teacher	Monitoring student transcript (GPA & credits)	transcript, graduation status
2	Student lacking mastery of standards in core content and FCAT. classes	Before and after school tutoring.	Instructional Coaches, Teacher	Monitoring student transcript (GPA & credits)	transcript, graduation status

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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	To increase the percentage of parental involvement in SAC, SAF, PTSA and other parent related activity.
2011 Current Level of Parent Involvement: *	2012 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: *
3%	5%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of communication with our parent stakeholders. Not hosting activities to involve parents.	Better publicize SAC, SAF, and PTSA meetings at the school. Host parent workshops for Freshman and Upperclassmen.	Assistant Principals and School Social Worker	Attendance at the various parent meetings. Parent feedback surveys on school website.	Attendance logs for SAC, SAF, PTSA meetings and workshops

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 and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SAT/ACT training	9-12	Department Heads	Core departments	Professional development throughout the school year.	Leadership Team monitoring process	Leadership Team
School Advisory Forum will offer monthly parent trainings during the SAF meeting.	9-12	School Advisory Forum members, teachers, guidance counselors	all stakeholders	SAF scheduled meeting every other month	parent feedback through survey	SAF Chair. Assistant Principal

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Student participation in academic acceleration: Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, CTE Completion will increase by 5%. Goal:

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Budget:

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

End of Student participation in academic acceleration: Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, CTE Completion will increase by 5%. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To offer before and after school tutoring to address reinforcement of benchmarks across disciplines	Released test items: core curriculum texts	SAC	\$3,000.00
Science	Provide students with hands on materials and state approved publications to increase student comprehension and mastery of the new science benchmarks and EOCs.	A variety of state approved laboratory and published materials for science instruction.	FTE	\$2,114.50
				Subtotal: \$5,114.50
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teen Biz	Differentiated Reading instruction focusing on benchmarks and state standards.	Perkins Grant Accountability	\$16,000.00
Science	Vernierware in lab	Using computer software (Vernierware) for labs		\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$16,600.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	FCAT Explorer	Using FCAT explorer to review benchmarks		\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Peer tutoring program	teacher supplement	accountability fund	\$1,000.00
Science	Science trip to Planetarium for juniors	Planetarium at Broward College in Davie		\$800.00
				Subtotal: \$1,800.00
				Grand Total: \$23,514.50

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Intervene
 Correct II
 Prevent II
 Correct I
 Prevent I
 NA

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/2/2011)

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.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Reading - Teen Biz	\$3,000.00
Reading – Supplement for the Academic Learning Workshop	\$1,000.00
Math – Supplement for Peer Tutoring Facilitator	\$1,000.00
Writing – Substitutes (Writing Seminars)	\$1,080.00
Parental Involvement - Workshop Supplies	\$200.00
Other – Substitutes (Attendance Committee)	\$1,000.00

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

The School Advisory Council(SAC)will:

1. Monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).
2. Determine and implement a variety of ways to increase parental involvement.
3. Identify the educational needs and priorities of all school stakeholders.
4. Monitor the use of accountability funds used to support programs/workshops/ professional development identified in the (SIP).
5. Assist in the evaluation of school data and actively participate in the accountability funds budget.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2008-2009

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Broward School District MONARCH HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	43%	74%	85%	26%	228	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	48%	72%			120	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	53% (YES)	60% (YES)			113	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					471	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					Pending	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District MONARCH HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	47%	77%	92%	33%	249	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	55%	76%			131	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	54% (YES)	67% (YES)			121	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					511	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District MONARCH HIGH SCHOOL 2008-2009						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	44%	80%	84%	33%	241	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	50%	78%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	53% (YES)	67% (YES)			120	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					499	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested