

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2011-2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Sara Abraham

SAC Chair: TBD

Superintendent: Joseph Burke, Ed.D.

Date of School Board Approval: TBA

Last Modified on: 9/22/2011

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	Sara Abraham	B.S. Elementary Education M.Ed. Curriculum	2	20	10/11 GCHS TBD 09/10 GCS A AYP-No 08/09 SMCA A AYP-Yes 07/08 SMCA C AYP-No 06/07 BSCS A AYP-Yes
Assis Principal	William Tonks	M.Ed. Ed Leadership, Educational Lead. (All Levels), English(Grades 6-12), Reading Endorsed	1	2	10/11 GICS A 09/10 GCS A AYP - Yes

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)
Math	Anthony Volpe	Mathematics, (grades 6 - 12), Mathematics, (grades 5 - 9), Art, (grades K - 12)	7	2	Works closely with teachers in grades 9-12 to increase student performance

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	CSUSA Hiring Practice	CSUSA Human Resources Department and Principal	08/01/10	

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
Christopher Diaz	Health/PE K-12	Health/PE	ESOL Classes through District Program
Ryan Finkelberg	English 6-12	English	ESOL Classes through District Program
Lorna Ermacora	Elem. Ed K-6, Middle Grades 5-9, ESE K-12	Jornalism, Speech Drama	ESOL Classes through District Program
Russ Turpin	English 6-12, Gifted Endorsed	English	ESOL Classes through District Program
David Cutter	Temporary/ Art		
Robert Daniels	Social Science 6-12	English	ESOL Classes through District Program, English K-12 Exam through FLDOE.
Derek Woods	Social Science	Math	ESOL Classes through District Program
Carlos Zerquera	Temporary Certification/English 6-12	English	ESOL Classes through District Program
David Berens	Temporary/Earth and Space Science 6-12	Science	ESOL Classes through District Program

Staff Demographics

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
40	15.0%(6)	35.0%(14)	35.0%(14)	15.0%(6)	30.0%(12)	0.0%(0)	7.5%(3)	0.0%(0)	10.0%(4)

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
Amber Jensen	New Teachers	Teacher Learning Community Supervisor	New Teacher Support Activities

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Sara Abraham, Principal
William Tonks, Assistant Principal
Janet Morris, Admin.
Robert Barnes, Guidance
TBA, SACS Chairperson

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 GCHS RtI Leadership Team developed a plan over the summer of 2011 to meet the needs of the GCHS students. The team reviewed data from the Spring 10 FCATs and developed a year long plan to improve learning in reading and math. The team will meet monthly to review the progress on the year long plan. The administrative team will conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs to monitor teacher instruction and commitment to the plan.

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 GCHS RtI Leadership Team will oversee the school improvement plan. Each administrator has been given a specific content area to oversee. The administrator is working with the teachers in each of the core areas to oversee the progress during the year and to work with the teachers in using the data to work on specific areas to help their students to improve their math and reading learning and raise their FCAT scores.

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.

GCHS uses the CSUSA benchmark testing system. Students are tested three times per year, once each quarter, in the areas of reading and math. These tests were developed to be similar to the Florida FCAT tests. The data from the tests is broken down in to the strands for each area and is available on the Student Information System (SIS). For example, reading is broken down into "Main Idea, Plot and Purpose" as well as the other three strands. Teachers have available to them, at all times, the percentage that the students got right in each of the strand areas. In addition, all of their FCATs are also broken down into each of the strands and the percentage correct in each area. Teachers also have access to the overall score of the FCAT tests the student has taken.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

The staff had a preschool training on the response to RtI in August of 2011. Teachers reviewed how the FCAT is used and what it tests. The teachers had training on how to use the SIS system to access the Benchmark and FCAT data analysis. Each teacher will be tracking all of the Level 1 and 2 students in reading and in math. Each teacher has set class goals and all level 1 and 2 students have set individual goals in reading and in math.

Lee County has also developed a support plan for each of the schools in Correct I. The team will provide any training, coaching, or guidance to help our school implement our plan

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Sara Abraham, Principal
William Tonks, Assistant Principal
Janet Morris, Admin.
Brian Kopp, LA Department Head

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

The GCHS School Leadership team meets every week throughout the school year. The LLT is a sub-group of the Leadership team and meets bimonthly. The Curriculum Coordinator is leader of the LLT meetings. Her role is to ensure that the goals of the literacy team are being met throughout the high school. The meetings consist of discussion of, implementation of, and evaluation of literacy-based initiatives at the school.

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

GCHS has implemented a major new reading initiative for all students and staff. The goal of the initiative is to get students to read and become lifelong readers. The program is called D.E.A.R. (Drop everything and read). This is a weekly program in which students are required to read silently for an extended period of time. The annual goal is for all high school students to read 15 books per year. Students complete a "Reading some great books at GCHS!" form when they have completed each book. Each student's progress is monitored by their Reading/LA teacher.

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.

*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.

Content area teachers and elective teachers are part of an ongoing program (unnamed program) at GCHS which includes reading in the content area and answering FCAT type questions regarding these readings. These readings are part of the Instructional Focus Calendar.

GCHS instituted a vocabulary program for all subject areas three years ago. Each subject area has an academic word list that pertains to their teaching area. These words are used as "word of the week" and/or "word of the day" in the various departments according to the instructional focus calendar.

*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?

All GCHS teachers are required to start each of their classes with "bellringers". The daily bellringers are a series of questions and/or scenarios developed by each department annually. These bellringers are specifically designed to show the relevance between what students are learning and how it relates to their everyday life and their future. For example, all students in

science courses have the same bellringer on the same day. In addition, all applied and integrated courses have curriculum maps which requires teachers to focus on real life connections to their subject matter.

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?

GCHS students develop a four year academic and career plan during their freshmen year with the assistance and advice of the guidance department. This four year plan is updated annually. The GCHS Program of Studies has suggested course selections for various career paths. This pathway helps students and their parents to determine what courses to take each year. The guidance department is very involved with college and career planning, hosting separate junior and senior seminars during the school year. These seminars focus on the student's course of study during their high school years that will enable them to meet their postsecondary plans.

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

The GCHS Guidance counselors meet with individual students to review and revise their four year academic and career plan due to the fact that student interests change over their high school career. Student files are kept that include student FCAT grades, transcripts, ACT and SAT grades, and any other pertinent information. Using the students goals and current performance, guidance helps the student to determine what they need to do to be ready for their postsecondary plans. In addition, guidance meets with each senior and develops a "senior contract" which outlines exactly what the student needs to complete during their senior year to meet the goals of their four year plan.

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:	In the 2011-2012 school year the GCHS students will improve in reading from 50% to 65% or meet Safe Harbor guidelines in reading.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Grade 9 Reading Proficiency: 56% and, Grade 10 Reading Proficiency: 41%	The Grade 9 Reading Proficiency goal is 62% and the Grade 10 Reading Proficiency goal is 47%.

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 has limited or poor reading strategy skills	Teach reading strategies and evaluate	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Reading teacher, Classroom teacher	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program	FAIR Assessment and Benchmark Reading Tests

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading Reading Goal #2:	In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of GCHS students performing above proficiency will be 30% of 9th and 10th grade students.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The percentage of students achieving above proficiency for grade 9 was 17% and for grade 10, 20%.	The goals for achieving above proficiency in reading for both grade 9 and 10 is 30%.

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 with limited reading strategy skills.	Improve student reading strategy skills.	Classroom teachers	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Tests

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

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading Reading Goal #3:	In the 2011-2012 school year, GCHS students making learning gains will increase from 56% to 60%.
--	--

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The current level of performance of students making learning gains is 56%.	In 2012, 9th and 10th grade students that will make learning gains in reading is 60%.

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 with limited or poor reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading Teachers, and Classroom Teachers	Progress on FAIR Reading Assessment and the CSUSA Benchmark Reading Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Tests.

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

4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading Reading Goal #4:	In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of the lowest 25% GCHS students making learning gains will increase from 52% to 60%.
--	---

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The current performance level of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading is 52%.	In 2012, both 9th and 10th grade students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will be 60%.

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 have limited or poor reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading Teachers, Classroom Teachers	Progress will be monitored by FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Testing Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark tests.

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:	In the 2011-2012 school year, the percent of Hispanic students making adequate yearly progress will increase from 41% to 51%.
---	---

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

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in Reading is 41%.	The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in reading will increase from 41%-51%.

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 with limited or low reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading Teachers, Classroom Teachers, ESOL contact	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Reading Benchmark Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Program.

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:	
Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5C:	
Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5D:	In the 2011-2012 school year, the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress will increase from 37% to 47%.
---	---

Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

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

Economically Disadvantaged students currently have 37% scoring at or above grade level in reading.	The Economically Disadvantaged students will increase in reading at or above grade level from 37% to 47%.
--	---

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 with limited or poor reading strategy skills.	Improve reading strategy skills.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Reading teaches and classroom teachers.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Testing Program.	FAIR Reading Assessment and CSUSA Benchmark Reading Tests.

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
Literacy Leadership Team	Grades 9-12	Janet Morris, Curriculum Coordinator	Schoolwide	Ongoing through May 2012	Online data	Janet Morris, Curriculum Coordinator
Language Arts Cohort	Grades 9-12	Brian Kopp, Department Chair	Schoolwide	Ongoing through May 2012	Analysis of Reading Benchmark Data and FCAT scores	Brian Kopp

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CSUSA Reading Benchmark Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$5,200.00
			Subtotal: \$5,200.00
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: \$5,200.00

End of Reading Goals

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:	For the 2011-2012 school year, the percent of students meeting proficiency in math will increase from 82% to 85%
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Student proficiency is based on EOC scores of 2 or higher for the 2011 school year. Of those that took the exam they were 82% proficient on the Algebra exam.	Proficiency in math will increase from 82% to 85%.

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 with limited or poor math skills.	All grade 9 & 10 students will take the CSUSA Math Benchmark three times per year.	AP of Curriculum, Math Dept. Chair, and Math Teachers.	Analysis of CSUSA Math Benchmark Testing Program.	CSUSA Math Benchmark tests.
2	Students with limited or poor math skills.	All students will use the FCAT Math Coach weekly in class for practice FCAT problems.	AP of Curriculum, Math Dept. Chair, and Math Teachers.	Analysis of FCAT Math Coach Problems.	FCAT Math Coach Quizzes.

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:	In the 2011-2012 school year the percent of GCHS students achieving above proficiency in math will increase from 34% to 40%
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Grade 9 students had 36% above proficiency while grade 10 had 32% above.	Students will increase performance from 34% to 40%.

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 with limited math knowledge.	Increase math knowledge using FCAT Coach Practice Problems Weekly.	Math Dept. Chair and Math Teachers.	Data analysis of progress in higher level math problems.	FCAT Math Coach quizzes.

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	In the 2011-2012 school year the GCHS students will
--	---

Mathematics Goal #3:	improve in math learning gains from 80% to 85%
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Students currently had 80% making learning gains in math.	Students will improve from 80% to 85%.

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 with limited math knowledge.	Increase math knowledge using FCAT Math Coach and CSUSA Math Benchmark program.	AP of Curriculum, Math Dept Chair and Math Teachers.	Data analysis of FCAT Math problems and Math benchmark tests.	FCAT Math Coach quizzes and Math Benchmark tests.

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

4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #4:	In the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of the lowest 25% students making learning gains in math will increase from 63% to 72%
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The current amount of lowest 25% making learning gains in math is 63%.	The percentage will increase from 63% to 72%.

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 with limited math knowledge.	Use of FCAT Math Coach weekly to improve math problem solving skills.	AP Curriculum, Math Dept Chair, Math Teachers	Data Analysis of student progress on quizzes.	FCAT Math Coach quizzes.

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:	In the 2011-2012 the percent of Hispanic students making adequate yearly progress will increase from 78% to 86%.
Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in Math is 78%.	The percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above grade level in math will increase from 78% to 86%

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with limited or poor math skills and strategies	Increase math knowledge using FCAT coach Practice Problems.	Math Dept. Chair, Math Coach, Math teachers, and ESOL contact	Data analysis of progress in higher level math problems.	FCAT math coach quizzes and CSUSA Benchmark assessments

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

5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics	
Mathematics Goal #5B:	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics	
Mathematics Goal #5C:	

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5D:		In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress in math will increase from 72% to 82%.			
Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
Economically disadvantaged students currently have 72% scoring at or above grade level in math.			The economically disadvantaged students will increase proficiency from 72% to 82% in math.		
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 with poor or limited math skills.	Improve math skills and knowledge using Practice problems, FCAT math coach, and CSUSA math benchmark program.	AP of Curriculum, Math Coach, Math Dept. Chair, and Math Teachers	Data analysis of Math benchmark tests, and FCAT practice problems.	CSUSA Math Benchmark tests and FCAT math coach quizzes.

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
Math Cohort	Grades 9-12	Erica Miller Dept. Chair, Anthony Volpe Math Coach	Math Teachers	Ongoing through May 2012	Math Benchmark Data Analysis	Anthony Volpe, Erica Miller, Math Teachers

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CSUSA Math Benchmark Testing Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$5,200.00
FCAT Math Coach	Practice Workbooks	School Budget	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,200.00
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: \$10,200.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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:	For the 2011-2012 school year, students will increase from 42% to 46% in science proficiency.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Students achieved 42% proficiency in science.	Students will improve proficiency from 42%-46% in science. 68% of 9th grade students taking Biology EOC will meet or exceed proficiency(level 3 or above).

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 with limited knowledge of science.	Increase science knowledge by use of classroom bellringer problems that mimic the FCAT problems.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Science Dept. Chair, Science Teachers	CSUSA Science Benchmark Testing Program.	CSUSA Benchmark Science Tests.

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science Science Goal #2:	Students achieving above proficiency will increase from 3% to 10% in science.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
Students achieving above proficiency in science totaled 3%.	Students will increase in above proficient range from 3% to 10% in science.

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 with limited science knowledge.	Use of FCAT Science Coach practice problems and CSUSA benchmark testing.	Asst. Principal, Science Dept. Chair, Science Teachers	Analysis of FCAT Coach quizzes and CSUSA Benchmark Science Tests.	FCAT Coach Book and CSUSA Science Benchmark Testing Program.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Cohort	Grades 9-12	Maricel Knapczyk	Science Teachers	Ongoing through May 2012	Analysis of FCAT Science Coach quizzes, CSUAS Benchmark	AP Curriculum, Dept. Chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CSUSA Science Benchmark Testing Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$2,600.00
FCAT Science Coach	FCAT Science Workbooks	School Budget	\$2,700.00
			Subtotal: \$5,300.00
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: \$5,300.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing Writing Goal #1:	For the 2011-2012 school year, sophomores will increase in writing proficiency from 83% to 87% proficient.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

Sophomores achieved 83% Writing Proficiency.		Sophomores will increase Writing Proficiency from 83% to 87%.			
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 with poor writing skills.	Improve writing skills in 9th through 12th grade students using grammar and writing drills daily.	Asst. Principal of Curriculum, Language Arts Teachers and all Classroom Teachers.	Analysis of writing prompt data for individual students by English teachers.	Writing Prompt data from individual students.

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing	
Writing Goal #2A:	
Writing Goal #2A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

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

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing	
Writing Goal #2B:	
Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

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

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

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C:	
Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D:	
Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Language Arts Cohort	English and Reading Gr. 9-12	Brian Kopp	English and Reading Teachers	Ongoing through May 2012	Analysis of Benchmark Reading Data and writing prompts.	LA Dept Chair, LA Teachers

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
see above			\$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:	In the 2011-2012 school year the GCHS students will improve attendance by 1%.
2011 Current Attendance Rate: *	2012 Expected Attendance Rate: *
The current rate of attendance at GCHS is 96.46% as of September 2011.	Statistically, the attendance rate at GCHS is good. The rate of attendance for 2011-2012 will improve by 1%.
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

Currently less than 1% of students attending GCHS have excessive absences.	The number of students with excessive absences will improve through the 2011-2012 school year.				
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
Currently there are less than 1% of students attending GCHS that have excessive Tardies to school.	The number of students with excessive tardies will improve.				
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	Transportation. GCHS students come from all over the county.	Analyze bus routes to see if travel time can be reduced and that buses are full.	Maria Wiesing.	Analysis of Data.	Bus routes and bus attendance rates.
2	Traffic during Parent Drop off at GCHS.	Analyzing the flow of traffic to see if the procedure can be more effective.	Administration, teachers with morning duties, and security.	Data analysis of attendance.	SIS attendance rates.

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		In the 2011-2012 school year, the number of GCHS suspensions and in-school suspensions will decrease.			
Suspension Goal #1:					
2011 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2012 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
There were 1330 in-school suspensions ranging from 1 period to full day suspensions.		The number of in-school suspensions will be reduced 25%.			
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In School		2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In School			
There were 1330 instances of ISS in 2010-2011 school year. These ranged from one class period to entire day served.		The number of individual students suspended in school will be reduced.			
2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
There were 396 out-of-school suspensions.		The number of out-of-school suspensions will be reduced by 50%.			
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out of School		2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out of School			
To be determined.		The number of individual students suspended out of school will be reduced.			
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 that do not follow rules and regulations.	Increase student recognition and understanding of rules and regulations.	AP of Discipline, Dean of Students	Analysis of 10/11 data.	District reports of student discipline issues.

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
Policies and Procedures	9-12	Cameron Yearsley	school-wide	Professional development days, and through faculty meetings	analyzing referrals, SIS data analysis for tracking behavior	Cameron Yearsley

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2009-2010 school year.</i>	In the 2011-2012 school year the number of GCHS students who drop out of school will be reduced by 1%.
2011 Current Dropout Rate: *	2012 Expected Dropout Rate: *
The current dropout rate for 2010-2011 is not available from the district. Traditionally, GCHS has a low drop out rate.	The drop out rate will decrease in 2011-2012.
2011 Current Graduation Rate: *	2012 Expected Graduation Rate: *
The current graduation rate is not available from the district. (In 08/09, the graduation rate was 93%.)	The graduation rate will increase by 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	Students not meeting the credit and/or the GPA criteria needed for graduation.	Students develop a 4 year plan with guidance that is monitored by their guidance counselor. Seniors also develop a senior contract.	Guidance counselors.	Analysis of data.	GCHS 4 year plan and senior contract.

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
Guidance Cohort	Grades 9-12	Guidance Department, Robert Barnes	Guidance Counselors	Ongoing through May 2012.	Analysis of 4 year plans and senior contracts.	Guidance director and guidance counselors.

Dropout Prevention Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Monitoring of student progress towards meeting graduation requirements (i.e. credits, GPA)	Paper plans and binders.	School paper and supply budget.	\$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

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>	Increase parent participation in performing parent volunteer hours at GCHS from 6000 to 7500 thereby increasing parent involvement in the school.
2011 Current Level of Parent Involvement: *	2012 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: *
Parents are required to perform 20 hours of volunteer work for GCHS per school year. Last year, parents performed a total of 6000 volunteer hours.	Increase the amount of parents performing their GCHS school volunteer hours to achieve a total of 7500 hours.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents not performing or keeping track of contact volunteer hours.	Send quarterly reminder reports of current volunteer hour status and volunteer opportunities.	Administrative Assistant	Maintaining parent volunteer hours log on line.	Student Information System-Volunteer Hours Tab.

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
SIS Training on Tracking Parent volunteer hours	All grades.	Administrative Assistant	Office Staff	Ongoing through May 2012	Quarterly Analysis of Parent Volunteer Hours	Office Manager

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student Information System			\$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)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	CSUSA Reading Benchmark Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$5,200.00
Mathematics	CSUSA Math Benchmark Testing Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$5,200.00
Mathematics	FCAT Math Coach	Practice Workbooks	School Budget	\$5,000.00
Science	CSUSA Science Benchmark Testing Program	Tests and Scantrons	School Budget	\$2,600.00
Science	FCAT Science Coach	FCAT Science Workbooks	School Budget	\$2,700.00
Dropout Prevention	Monitoring of student progress towards meeting graduation requirements (i.e. credits, GPA)	Paper plans and binders.	School paper and supply budget.	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Student Information System			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$20,700.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	see above			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$20,700.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Intervene
 Correct II
 Prevent II
 Correct I
 Prevent I
 NA

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/21/2011)

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

No A+ funding.

\$0.00

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

The School Advisory Council will meet regularly. The goal of the SAC is that all students will receive a quality education. The SAC will assist in the development and evaluation of the school improvement plan (SIP). The SAC will review relevant data (FCAT scores and benchmark scores), identify areas that need improvement, help develop strategies to facilitate school improvement, and monitor the progress made toward improvement. The SAC will also assist the principal with the annual school budget.

AYP DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Lee School District GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	48%	82%	83%	42%	255	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	56%	80%			136	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	52% (YES)	63% (YES)			115	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					516	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					Pending	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	50%	77%	84%	33%	244	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	51%	79%			130	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	47% (NO)	67% (YES)			114	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					498	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District GATEWAY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 2008-2009						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	47%	71%	78%	45%	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	54%	74%			128	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	64% (YES)			122	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					501	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested