

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2009 - 2010 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: David V. Basile

SAC Chair: Tracie Casserly

Superintendent: James F. Notter

Date of School Board Approval: 12-01-2009

Last Modified on: 09-11-2009

Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32395

Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chance  
K-12 Public Schools  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32395

## VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

All students will graduate from South Plantation High School within four years prepared for post-secondary education or a career path. This will be accomplished through offering diverse, interesting and rigorous course-work, increased professional development opportunities for teachers and implementing safety nets for students who are at-risk of not meeting this goal.

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### SCHOOL PROFILE/DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Brief History and Background of the School

When South Plantation High School opened in 1971, the students were on double sessions at the Plantation High School Campus. The South Plantation building was not completed until February 1972. In 1975 a Deaf and Hard of Hearing cluster was established at South Plantation. In 1984, the drama department received its first national recognition as one of only 15 schools in the United States and Canada to be named a Center of Excellence. In 1993 South Plantation was named a National School of Excellence. In 2002, South Plantation High School became a magnet school. The first year, the Everglades Restoration Environmental Magnet opened with 170 students. In 2006, South Plantation High School earned a letter grade of B under the state's accountability system.

#### Unique School Strengths for Next Year

- Common planning times are being implemented for teachers in the English, Math, Reading, Science, and Social Studies departments to increase professional development opportunities as well as create common assessments.
- Instructional coaches in Math, Reading, and Science have been added.
- Environmental Magnet was named a Magnet School of Distinction for the second year in a row.
- Diane Stecker was named the Florida Daughters of the American Revolution Social Studies Teacher of the Year in 2009.
- Solar car team placed first in the nation in summer of 2009.
- Eco Geeks won the Lexus Nexus award which includes \$50,000 in grant monies.
- Wendy Bernstein was an Acclaim Award nominee for Assistant Principal of the Year in 2009.
- Student enrollment remains steady at 2500 students.

#### Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

- Budget cuts have resulted in a loss of teachers, which leaves 20+ sections uncovered.
- School grade dropped to a D in 2009.

#### Student Demographics

- Female Percentage – 2007: 50.1; 2008: 50.2; 2009: 49.9
- Male Percentage – 2007: 49.8; 2008: 49.7; 2009: 50.0
- White Percentage – 2007: 31.0; 2008: 30.8; 2009: 30.3
- Black Percentage – 2007: 44.3; 2008: 43.5; 2009: 42.9
- Hispanic Percentage – 2007: 20.7; 2008: 20.7; 2009: 21.8
- Asian Percentage – 2007: 2.08; 2008: 2.59; 2009: 2.87
- Native Percentage – 2007: 0.30; 2008: 0.18; 2009: 0.11
- Multi Percentage – 2007: 1.50; 2008: 2.14; 2009: 1.92
- Free Reduced Percentage – 2007: 42.7; 2008: 43.7; 2009: 48.5
- ELL Percentage – 2007: 7.87; 2008: 7.55; 2009: 7.51
- ESE Percentage – 2007: 9.03; 2008: 9.47; 2009: 9.87
- Total Enrollment – 2494

- Magnet Enrollment – 562
- Free and Reduced Lunch – 1240
- ELL Enrollment – 257
- ESE Enrollment – 366
- Grade 9 – 631
- Grade 10 – 615
- Grade 11 – 628
- Grade 12 – 620
- White – 750
- Black – 1018
- Hispanic – 582
- Asian – 73
- Indian – 6
- Multi – 65

Student Attendance Rates

- 2007: 91.50; 2008: 91.00; 2009: 90.10

Student Mobility

- 2007: 20.90; 2008: 17.20; 2009: 18.90

Student Suspension Rates

- In-School Suspension – 2007: 46.80; 2008: 36.00; 2009: 24.40
- Out-of-School Suspension – 2007: 19.00; 2008: 16.00; 2009: 12.20

Student Retention Rates

- 2007: 7.84; 2008: 9.36; 2009: 0.7

Class Size

- 2007: 24.36; 2008: 24.42; 2009: 24.30

Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

2008-09 School Grade:  
 Seminole Middle School - A  
 Parkway Middle School - C  
 New River Middle School - B  
 Plantation Park Elementary School - A  
 Tropical Elementary School - A

Partnerships and Grants

- American Intercontinental University
- Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale
- Chuck Puleri and Associates
- Family Vending
- Florida Career College
- Free Style-Systems.com
- Huntington Learning Center
- McGonigle Accounting
- Mr. D's
- Plantation Kiwanis Club
- Smith Barney
- Sports and Activities Directory

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

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

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

HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record *   |
|----------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
|          |      |                             |                              |                                | Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>Math Mastery: 73% |

|                 |                 |  |    |    |   |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|----|----|---|
| Principal       | David V. Basile | <p>BA- Government and International Studies; University of South Carolina</p> <p>MS- Secondary Education; University of Pennsylvania</p> <p>MS- Educational Leadership; University of South Carolina</p> <p>Ed.D. – Educational Leadership; Nova Southeastern University</p> | 3  | 14 | <p>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 86%<br/>AYP: 67% criteria met- White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2007-2008:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 43%<br/>Math Mastery: 72%<br/>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 84%<br/>AYP: 85% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, and ELL did not meet AYP in Reading; ELL did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2006-2007:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 41%<br/>Math Mastery: 67%<br/>Science Mastery: 40%<br/>Writing Mastery: 78%<br/>AYP: 67% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p>   |
| Assis Principal | Wendy Bernstein | <p>BS – Mathematics and History; Northern Illinois University</p> <p>MS – Educational Leadership; Florida Atlantic University</p> <p>Ed.S. – Educational Leadership</p>  | 11 | 5  | <p>Assistant Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br/>Grade: D<br/>Reading Mastery: 42%<br/>Math Mastery: 73%<br/>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 86%<br/>AYP: 67% criteria met- White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2007-2008:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 43%<br/>Math Mastery: 72%<br/>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 84%<br/>AYP: 85% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, and ELL did not meet AYP in Reading; ELL did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2006-2007:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 41%<br/>Math Mastery: 67%<br/>Science Mastery: 40%<br/>Writing Mastery: 78%<br/>AYP: 67% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2005-2006:<br/>Grade: B<br/>Reading Mastery: 42%<br/>Math Mastery: 73%<br/>Writing Mastery: 83%<br/>AYP: 74% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading; SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2004-2005:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 40%<br/>Math Mastery: 70%<br/>Writing Mastery: 87%<br/>AYP: 80% criteria met- Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading; ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> |
| Assis Principal | Monty Escabi    | <p>Ph.D. – Administration</p> <p>Certificate of Advanced Studies In Administration</p>   | 2  | 21 | <p>Assistant Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br/>Grade: D<br/>Reading Mastery: 42%<br/>Math Mastery: 73%<br/>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 86%<br/>AYP: 67% criteria met- White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2007-2008:<br/>Grade: C<br/>Reading Mastery: 43%<br/>Math Mastery: 72%<br/>Science Mastery: 35%<br/>Writing Mastery: 84%<br/>AYP: 85% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, and ELL did not meet AYP in Reading; ELL did not make AYP in Math</p>  |

|                 |                  |  |     |     |  |
|-----------------|------------------|--|-----|-----|--|
|                 |                  | MA – Educational Psychology  |     |     | Assistant Principal of Western High School.<br>2006:<br>Grade: A<br><br>2005:<br>Grade: C<br><br>2004:<br>Grade: C<br><br>2003:<br>Grade: B<br><br>2002:<br>Grade: B<br><br>2001:<br>Grade: A  |
| Assis Principal | Christy Henschel | Bachelor of Social Work<br><br>Master of Social Work<br><br>Educational Leadership Certification | 1   | 2   | Assistant Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>Math Mastery: 73%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 86%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met-<br>White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math<br><br>Assistant Principal/Behavior Specialist at Cypress Bay High School.<br><br>*A* for 5 years<br>Made safe harbor 2 years   |
| Assis Principal | Debra Johnson    | BS- English<br><br>ESOL Certification<br><br>MS- Educational Leadership                          | 1   | 7   | Assistant Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>Math Mastery: 73%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 86%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met-<br>White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math<br><br>Assistant Principal Stranahan High School 2005-2007; moved school grade from D to C, increased 10th Grade FCAT Writes from 77% to 92% proficiency rate<br><br>Assistant Principal Hallandale High School 2003-2005; moved school grade from D to C<br><br>Assistant Principal Dillard High School 2002-2003; moved school grade from F to D (10 points from a C)<br><br>Miramar High School 2001-2002; moved school grade from D to C<br><br>Miramar High School 1999-2001; increased FCAT Writes score from 2.8 to 4.0<br><br>Increased writing scores at all schools |
| Assis Principal | Ronald Reed      | BA – K-12 Physical Education<br><br>MA – Educational Leadership                                  | 2.5 | 5.5 | Assistant Principal of South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>Math Mastery: 73%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 86%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met-<br>White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math<br><br>2007-2008:<br>Grade: C<br>Reading Mastery: 43%<br>Math Mastery: 72%<br>Science Mastery: 35%<br>Writing Mastery: 84%<br>AYP: 85% criteria met-<br>Black, Hispanic, ED, and ELL did not meet AYP in Reading; ELL did not make AYP in Math<br><br>2006-2007:<br>Grade: C<br>Reading Mastery: 41%<br>Math Mastery: 67%<br>Science Mastery: 40%<br>Writing Mastery: 78%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met-<br>Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading; Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math  |

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

## HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

| Subject Area | Name           | Degree(s)/ Certification(s)   | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as a Coach | Prior Performance Record *  |
|--------------|----------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Reading      | Donna Rose     | BA – Elementary Ed (K-8) and Special Ed (K-12)<br>MA – Educational Psycholog<br>ESOL Endorsed<br>Reading Endorsed | 4                            | 1                     | Reading teacher at South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Learning Gains: 50%<br>Math Learning Gains: 57%  |
| Reading      | Orkisha Edmond | BA – Reading<br>MA – Reading<br>ESOL Endorsed   | 3                            | 3                     | Reading Coach at South Plantation High School in 2008 – 2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Mastery: 42%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met- White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading<br><br>2007-2008:<br>Grade: C<br>Reading Mastery: 43%<br>AYP: 85% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, and ELL did not meet AYP in Reading<br><br>2006-2007:<br>Grade: C<br>Reading Mastery: 41%<br>AYP: 67% criteria met- Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading |
| Mathematics  | Pamela Black   | BS – Math Education<br>MS – Educational Technology<br>Certified 6-12 Math<br>Gifted Endorsed                      | 10                           |                       | Math teacher at South Plantation High School in 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Learning Gains: 72%<br>Math Learning Gains: 89%   |
| Science      | Keisha Maxwell | BSc., MA, Biology 6-12; Earth-Space Science 6-12 (SAE)  | 4                            |                       | Science teacher at South Plantation High School 2008-2009.<br>Grade: D<br>Reading Learning Gains: 55%<br>Math Learning Gains: 78%   |

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

## HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

| Description of Strategy   | Person Responsible                                 | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Induction: site-based program utilized to assist educators in developing effective teaching behaviors and to retain qualified teachers by connecting New Educators to a supportive system. | NESS Liaison Assistant Principal                   | On-going                  |   |
| 2. Mentoring: Intra-departmental pairing of successful teachers with teachers needing assistance in various classroom functions.  | Department Heads Assistant Principal               | On-going                  |   |
| 3. National Board Certification: Incentives and recognition for teachers to pursue National Board Certification for purposes of improving their instructional strategies.                     | Principal  | On-going                  |   |
| 4. Bi-monthly professional development  | Professional Development Focus Team Administration | on-going                  |   |

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

| Name             | Certification                               | Teaching Assignment             | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified  |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Barbara McNeile  | Ft Vocational Professional Registered Nurse | Health                          | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Glenna Humphries | Social Studies 6-12                         | Debate I<br>Honors<br>Debate II | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in   |

|                   |  |  |                           |  |
|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|
|                   |  |  | Honors                    | conjunction with their supervising administrator.  |
| Susan Steege      | Speech Correction                          |  | Social Studies 9-12       | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Keisha Maxwell    | Biology 6-12                               |  | Physical science          | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Thomas Kaestner   | Math 5 - 9                                 |  | Algebra 2                 | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Matt Zealy        | Biology 6-12                               |  | Physical science Honors   | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Nick Duarte       | Biology 6-12                               |  | Physical Science honors   | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Anthony Acierno   | English 6-12                               |  | English 3 - thru ESOL     | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Katherine Boutine | Mathematics 6-12                           |  | Physics Honors AP Physics | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Marsha Samuels    | Biology 6-12                               |  | Physical Science          | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Sonya Hamil       | Chemistry 6-12                             |  | Biology Honors            | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Kathryn Cruz      | Middle Grade Science<br>Physical Education |  | Water Safety              | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |
| Sara Henry        | ElementaryK-6                              |  | Intensive Reading         | Teachers will complete a PGP outlining strategies they will employ to become highly qualified in conjunction with their supervising administrator. |

### Staff Demographics

| 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 | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 145                                 | 2                        | 24   | 35  | 38   | 46                                  | 90                 | 5                           | 9                                   | 46              |

### Teacher Mentoring Program

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing   | Planned Mentoring Activities   |
|-------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Gail Pucker | Dania St. Clair | Gail Pucker is a national board certified teacher with many years of experience that Dania as a first year teacher will | Classroom Management<br>Classroom Assessments<br>District Requirements Certification<br>Alternative Assessment Strategies<br>ESOL & ESE Strategies<br>Lesson Plans<br>Pinnacle Gradebook |

|                  |                |  |   |
|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Cynthia Gatewood | Jessica Vaughn | benefit from.<br>Cynthia Gatewood is an experienced teacher who works in the ninth grade academy as will Jessica.  | Classroom Management<br>Classroom Assessments<br>District Requirements<br>Certification<br>Alternative Assessment Strategies<br>ESOL & ESE Strategies<br>Lesson Plans<br>Pinnacle Gradebook |
| Barbara McNeile  | Bud Warren     | Barbara McNeile is an experienced teacher who has served as a mentor for many years. In addition, Barbara served in the role of New Educator Support System (NESS) liaison | Classroom Management<br>Classroom Assessments<br>District Requirements<br>Certification<br>Alternative Assessment Strategies<br>ESOL & ESE Strategies<br>Lesson Plans<br>Pinnacle Gradebook |

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Title I, Part A

South Plantation High School is a newly identified Title One school for the 2009-10 school year. Title I services has provided three instructional coaches and additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students during the instructional day. In addition, parental activities are planned that will assist parents in helping their child improve his/her academic performance.

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.

David Basile (Principal), Christine Henschel (Assistant Principal), Andrea Segal (Guidance Counselor), Donna Rose and Orkisha Edmonds (Reading Coaches), Kiesha Maxwell (Science Coach), Pam Black (Math Coach), Tracie Casserly (SAC Chair), Wendy Bernstein (Assistant Principal), Susan Steege (BTU Steward), and Monty Escabi (Assistant Principal).

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions).

As students are referred, the group will meet to discuss concerns with student and parent. Team will create a plan in conjunction with the student and/or parents which will include safety nets for the student as well as other academic/behavioral supports. The student will be monitored weekly by the leadership team to determine effectiveness of the intervention.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan

The team will provide input as to the safety nets or other supports that are offered by the school. Members of the team will take part in the review and monitoring of the plan.

### RtI Implementation

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

Team will analyze data to fit appropriate response tier with student need.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Leadership team will be trained by District Staff, who will in turn be responsible for training the staff of the school. Training will start during pre-planning and continue until all staff is trained. Student identification will start immediately using information/data from the previous school year.

## School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

### Plan

Data Disaggregation 2008-2009 FCAT Data

What strengths and weaknesses were identified in the 2009 data by grade level, subject area, and clusters/strands?

Strengths: 9th grade: Words/Phrases and Main Idea/Purpose; 10th grade: Comparisons; 9th grade: Geometry; 10th grade: Measurement, Algebraic Thinking and Data Analysis; 11th grade: Life and Environmental Sciences.

Weaknesses: 9th grade: Reference and Research; 10th grade: Words and Phrases, Main Idea/Purpose, and Reference and Research; 9th grade: Number Sense and Measurement; 10th grade: Number Sense; 11th grade: Physical and Chemical Sciences.

### Instructional Calendar Development

What is the process for developing, implementing, and monitoring an Instructional Focus Calendar for reading, writing, mathematics, and science?

The instructional focus calendars were developed by the district to be implemented in the schools. Administration as well as the Reading Coaches, Math Coach, Science Coach and department heads will be responsible for monitoring the use of the Instructional Focus Calendars. Data will be collected utilizing classroom walk-throughs, and observations by Instructional

coaches and department heads.

Which instructional Benchmarks will be given priority focus, based on need, for each content area (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)?

South Plantation High School will be following the district Instructional Focus Calendars.

What is the process to ensure instruction is based on individual students' needs, as opposed to the master schedule?

Administration and Instructional Coaches will meet with teachers to discuss individual student data. Classroom observations will be utilized to determine that teachers are meeting the academic needs of their students.

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

Taste of South gave students an opportunity to see Culinary, Technology Studies, and Horticulture courses in action. This provided students with a chance to see what the courses have to offer and if they are interested in pursuing a career in those fields.

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?

Taste of South gave students an opportunity to see Culinary, Technology Studies, and Horticulture courses in action. This provided students with a chance to see what the courses have to offer and if they are interested in pursuing a career in those fields. In addition, a curriculum fair was held during lunches for students to see what courses were being offered for the coming school year and ask any questions they had prior to course selection.

#### DO

Direct the Instructional Focus

How are lesson plans and instructional delivery aligned across grade levels and subject areas?

Teachers in English, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Reading departments will have a common planning period to enhance professional development and share best practices. All ninth grade academy teachers will have a common planning to promote interdepartmental lessons.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?

Teachers of common courses will work together to create and implement instructional focus lessons. Instructional coaches will model lessons for teachers.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

Instructional focus lessons will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs and collecting of lesson plans.

#### CHECK

Assessment

Describe the types of ongoing formative assessments to be used during the school year to measure student progress in core, supplemental, and intensive instruction/intervention.

Mini-benchmark assessment tests; BAT I and II, and FAIR testing.

How are assessments used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery?

Assessments will be utilized to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. Mastery levels are set by the corresponding assessment.

Maintenance

How is ongoing assessment and maintenance of Benchmark mastery for each grade level and content area built into the Instructional Focus Calendar?

Assessment is built into the Instructional Focus Calendar.

Describe the process and schedule for teams to review progress monitoring data (summative and mini assessments) to identify the required instructional modifications that are needed to increase student achievement.

Leadership team will meet to discuss data, then will review the results during data chats with individual teachers.

Monitoring

Describe the Principal's and Leadership Team's roles as instructional leaders and how they will be continuously involved in the teaching and learning process.

Administration will support teachers by offering diverse professional development opportunities. In addition, administration will monitor classroom instruction utilizing classroom walk-throughs.

ACT

Supplemental and Intensive Instruction/Interventions

Identify the core, supplemental, and intensive instruction and interventions.

EDGE reading programs, Intensive Mathematics courses, school-wide safety nets, and RTI.

How are supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions and tutorials structured to re-teach non-mastered target areas?

All instruction is based off identified areas of weakness.

How does the school identify staff's professional development needs to improve their instructional strategies?

Conduct staff needs assessment after reviewing and analyzing teacher and student data.

Which students will be targeted for supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions?

All Level 1 and 2 students in reading and math as well as any student who is deemed at-risk by the RTI leadership team.

How will the effectiveness of the interventions be measured throughout the year?

Using mini-benchmark assessment tests, BAT I and II and FAIR assessments.

Enrichment

Describe alternative instructional delivery methods to support acceleration and enrichment activities.

Project based instruction will be used to supplement instructional activities.

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

Student data will show those students that are performing at a mastery level or above grade level. Through teacher recommendation, performance review, and district "highly likely report."

Professional Learning Communities

| PLC Organization (grade level, subject, etc.) | PLC Leader         | Frequency of PLC Meetings | Schedule (when)                 | Primary Focus of PLC (include Lesson Study and Data Analysis)  |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Instructional Leadership                      | Wendy Bernstein    | Monthly                   | Second Monday during 5th Period | Book Study; Data Analysis; Building the leadership capacity of department heads  |
| Reading in the Content Areas                  | Debra Johnson      | Monthly                   | First Tuesday                   | Data Analysis; Reading strategies for content area teachers  |
| Project Based Learning                        | Christine Henschel | Monthly                   | Second Tuesday                  | Teachers will share best practices from their subject area and work together to create a major project across several departments. |
|   |                    |                           |                                 | By providing and sharing comprehensive   |

|   |               |                      |                    |  |
|---|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|
| Go Green  | Ron Reed      | Monthly              | First Wednesday    | and current information on a wide array of green issues, "Going Green" aims to discover, teach, and support innovative teaching strategies that increase awareness and encourage activism in order to seek real solutions to the rapidly growing |
| Future Educational Trends for Student Achievement | Monty Escabi  | Monthly              | Second Tuesday     | Assess the technological needs of South Plantation High School and develop a team of professionals that will improve and implement policies and programs that will help staff become more efficient and as result improve student learning       |
| New Teachers                                      | David Basile  | Monthly              | Second Tuesday     | To increase the professional capacity of teachers with less than 5 years teaching experience.  |
| Early Release Professional Study days             | PD Team       | 6 Early Release Days | Early Realeas Days | To increase the professional capacity of teachers  |
| Wednesday Professional Development                | PD Focus Team | Wednesdays           | Bi-Monthly         | To increase the professional capacity of teachers  |

### NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
No Attached Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification  
No Attached Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
No Attached Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

### Pre-School Transition

### Postsecondary Transition

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

- Identify students who typically do not enroll in AP courses and register them for the coming school year
  - Increase the number of students who are exposed to honors and Pre-AP courses
  - Institute small group pull-out for students and guidance counselors to work on college preparations
  - Encourage 11th grade students to take the ACT or SAT by the end of their junior year
  - Annual Curriculum Fair to provide students with information for appropriate course selection

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goal

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Needs Assessment: | Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:<br><br>Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?<br><br>What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?<br><br>Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?<br><br>Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?<br><br>Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains? |
|-------------------|--|

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| In grades 9 and 10 40% of students were reading at grade level    |  | By May 2010, at least 50% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in reading on the FCAT SSS Reading Test. |   |   |
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | <p>1. All 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FCAT SSS Reading in 2009 will be placed in an EDGE comprehension intervention reading program which utilizes novel study, literary analysis, language acquisition, and strategic reading strategies.</p> <p>2. Include higher order questions in lesson and assessments. Higher order question stems poster will be posted in every classroom.</p> <p>3. A content area literacy plan will be implemented for the school year.</p> <p>4. Incentive Program "What's your bling?" for passing and/or making learning gains on the FCAT.</p> <p>5. Drop Everything and Read program.</p> <p>6. Provide differentiated instruction through a rotational model which will include whole group instruction, small group instruction, listening centers, and individual practice in all EDGE reading classes.</p> <p>7. Student data chats</p> | Orkisha Edmond, Donna Rose, Debra Johnson, Wendy Bernstein, Christine Henschel, Diane Feraco, Reading Teachers, Monty Escabi, Ron Reed  | <p>1. District will monitor if students are placed in the appropriate EDGE reading course. Administration will monitor implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>2. Reading coaches and administration will monitor the usage of higher order questions during classroom observations. Department head and reading coaches will monitor assessments to ensure higher order questions are being utilized.</p> <p>3. Reading coaches and administrators will monitor the implementation of the literacy plan during classroom walk-throughs and checking lesson plans.</p> <p>4. Reading coaches and administrators will monitor implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>5. Reading coaches and administrators will monitor implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>6. Reading coaches and administration will monitor the utilization of the rotational model during classroom observations.</p> <p>7. Classroom teachers will conduct data chats with students regarding previous year's FCAT testing results.</p> | <p>1. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-Benchmark tests; FAIR assessments; Benchmark Assessment Tests.</p> <p>2. Classroom walk-through evaluation tool and classroom assessments.</p> <p>3. Classroom walk-through evaluation tool and teacher lesson plans.</p> <p>4. Classroom walk-through observation tool and 2010 FCAT results.</p> <p>5. Classroom walk-through observation tool.</p> <p>6. Classroom walk-through evaluation tool and classroom assessments.</p> <p>7. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement |
|---|---|

| The lowest 25% making gains in reading fell from 45% to 44% over the previous year. |  | By May 2010, at least 52% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the DOE Accountability Rule will demonstrate annual learning gains in reading on the FCAT SSS Reading Test. |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | <p>1. All 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FCAT SSS Reading in 2009 will be placed in an EDGE comprehension intervention reading program which utilizes novel study, literary analysis, language acquisition, and strategic reading strategies.</p> <p>2. To improve deficient comprehension skills, all fluent 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 2 on the 2009 FCAT Reading Test are placed in a content area class which utilizes the incorporation of differentiated instruction and strategic reading strategies in the content area instruction and assessment.</p> <p>3. Word of the Day program.</p> <p>4. Plan supplemental instruction for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by benchmark data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p> <p>4. Pull-out instruction for 9th and 10th grade students in the lowest 25%</p> <p>5. Model instructional strategies for content area teachers, during instructional time.</p> | 1. Orkisha Edmond, Donna Rose, Debra Johnson, Wendy Bernstein, Christine Henschel.  | <p>1. District will monitor if students are placed in the appropriate EDGE reading course. Administration will monitor implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>2. Administrators will monitor implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs. Reading coaches will offer professional development opportunities for teachers in reading strategies.</p> <p>3. Reading coaches and administrators will select a word of the day and read it over the PA to build student vocabulary and word recognition skills.</p> <p>4. Student progress is assessed periodically for all level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading classes.</p> <p>4. Administration will monitor the implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>5. Administration will monitor the implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom walk-throughs.</p> | <p>1. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> <p>2. Classroom walk-through evaluation tool; Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> <p>3. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> <p>4. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; BAT I and II; classroom assessments and teacher evaluations.</p> <p>4. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> <p>5. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; FAIR assessments; and BAT I and II.</p> |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement       |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement                          |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| In grades 9 and 10, 10% of all ELL students were reading at grade level |   | Improve the number of ELL students reading at grade level by 10% |  |   |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step                | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step                                   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | All A1 and A2 students will be placed in a developmental language program | 1. Christine Henschel, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi             | Student progress is assessed periodically by the classroom teacher and ESOL coordinator. | BAT I and II; FAIR assessment; and classroom assessments. |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement          |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| In grades 9 and 10, 25% of all black students were reading at grade level. |  | By May 2010, at least 35% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in reading on the FCAT SSS Reading Test. |  |  |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | 1. Ninth Grade students will participate in Building Academic Vocabulary to increase background knowledge of content specific subject matter | 1. Donna Rose and classroom teachers.<br>2. Orkisha Edmond, Debra Johnson, Dianne Feraco, and Donna Rose  | <p>1. Students will be periodically assessed by the classroom teacher and Reading Coaches.</p> <p>2. Administration and reading coaches will</p> | <p>1. BAT I and II; FAIR assessment; FCAT; and classroom assessments.</p> <p>2. Department meeting agendas and classroom observations.</p> |

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| vocabulary.<br>2. Reading teachers will utilize common planning to analyze student data and implement appropriate literacy strategies.<br>3. Students will receive additional literacy support through their mathematics courses. | 3. Pam Black, Ron Reed, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, and Wendy Bernstein | facilitate data discussions with reading teachers and monitor the implementation of literacy strategies.<br>3. Students will be periodically assessed by the classroom teacher, Math Coach and Reading Coaches. | 3. BAT I and II; FAIR assessment; FCAT; and classroom assessments. |
|---|--|---|--|

|  |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement                      |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |  |  |
| In grades 9 and 10, 27% of all students with disabilities were reading at grade level. |   | By May 2010, at least 35% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in reading on the FCAT SSS Reading Test. |  |  |
|  | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | 1. Students will participate in Drop Everything and Read, for 15 minutes weekly throughout the school year.<br>2. Students will receive pull-out instruction to assist them with weak benchmarks. | 1. Orkisha Edmond, Donna Rose, Wendy Bernstein, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed, Christine Henschel, and Monty Escabi.<br>2. Benay Jones, Donna Rose, Richard Zeher.                          | 1. Administration and coaches will monitor the implementation of effective reading instruction during classroom observations.<br>2. ESE Specialist will monitor that pull-out instruction is taking place and students will be periodically assessed by the classroom teacher. | 1. Classroom walk-throughs, BAT I and II, FAIR, mini-benchmark assessments, and FCAT.<br>2. Classroom walk-throughs, BAT I and II, FAIR, mini-benchmark assessments, and FCAT. |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed   | Content/Topic   | Facilitator    | Target Date      | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring   | Person Responsible for Monitoring       |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---|---|
| Reduce the number of students below grade level in Reading by 10% | CRISS and/or McRelTraining will be provided for all English, Reading and Content Area teachers.   | District staff | August - March   | Administration will review lesson plans to ensure CRISS strategies are being used in the content areas.                                       | Assistant Principal and Reading Coaches |
| Increase the reading gains for the lowest 25% by 6%               | Teachers will be trained in FCIM to plan for re-teaching, remediation, and enhancement of the lowest quartile student's reading skills. | Orkisha Edmond | August - October | Administration will review lesson plans and conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure the needs of the lowest quartile students are being met. | Assistant Principal and Reading Coaches |

For Schools with Grades 6-12, Describe the Plan to Ensure the Responsibility of Teaching Reading for Every Teacher

South Plantation High School will implement a Literacy Plan to be followed by all staff members. All teachers will be responsible for implementing the school-wide Drop Everything and Read initiative. Reading strategies will be provided as part of twice a month professional development. Administration and reading coaches will monitor the implementation of the school-wide literacy plan, content area reading strategies and compliance with DEAR.

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                |                   |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source | Available Amount  |
| Edge Reading Material                 | General Fund   | \$8,000.00        |
|                                       |                | Total: \$8,000.00 |
| Technology                            |                |                   |
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source | Available Amount  |
| No Data                               | No Data        | \$0.00            |
|                                       |                | Total: \$0.00     |
| Professional Development              |                |                   |
| Description of Resources              | Funding Source | Available Amount  |

|  |                               |                          |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Reduce the number of students below grade level in Reading by 5% | CRISS Training - General Fund | \$2,000.00               |
| Staff Development Material                                       | General Fund                  | \$500.00                 |
|  |                               | Total: \$2,500.00        |
| Other  |                               |                          |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source                | Available Amount         |
| No Data  | No Data                       | \$0.00                   |
|  |                               | Total: \$0.00            |
|  |                               | Final Total: \$10,500.00 |

End of Reading Goal

## Mathematics Goal

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Needs Assessment: | Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:  |
|                   | Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?  |
|                   | What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?  |
|                   | Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?                                   |
|                   | Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains? |
|                   | Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?          |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement                           |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |   |
| In grades 9 and 10 70% of students are meeting with high standards were proficient in math. |  | By May 2010, at least 78% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. |   |   |
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FCAT SSS Math test will be placed in an Intensive Math course.</li> <li>Include higher order questions in lesson and assessments.</li> <li>Math assessments for 9th and 10th grade students will be written in FCAT format.</li> <li>Utilize FCAT binder developed by the Math Department to embed FCAT skills in the regular curriculum.</li> <li>Utilize data from Virtual Counselor, BEEP, and school based professional development to differentiate classroom instruction.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pam Black, Wendy Bernstein, Christine Henschel<br/>Tom Kaestner, Math Teachers, Ron Reed.</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check enrollment of students in Intensive Math courses.</li> <li>The math coach and administration will monitor the usage of higher order questions during classroom observations. Department head and math coach will monitor assessments to ensure higher order questions are being utilized.</li> <li>The math coach and department head will work with classroom teachers to implement assessments that are similar in style to those that students will see on the FCAT.</li> <li>The math coach will meet with teachers to familiarize them with the FCAT binder, which includes classopeners, pre and post tests, as well as worksheets.</li> <li>The math coach will hold data chats with the teachers and discuss how differentiation will take place in their classrooms. After the data chats, the math coach, administrators and department head will conduct classroom walk-throughs to determine the level of implementation.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master schedule, student schedules, and FCAT scores.</li> <li>Classroom walk-through evaluation tool, lesson plans and classroom assessments.</li> <li>Classroom assessments</li> <li>Classroom walk-through evaluation tool, lesson plans and classroom assessments</li> <li>Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessment tests; and BAT I and II.</li> </ol> |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement                     |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |   |
| The lowest 25% making gains in math decreased from 70% to 66% over the previous year. |  | By May 2010, at least 71% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the DOE Accountability Rule will demonstrate annual learning gains in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. |   |   |
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FCAT SSS Math test will be placed in an Intensive Math course.</li> <li>Include higher order questions in lesson and assessments.</li> <li>Math assessments for 9th and 10th grade students will be written in FCAT format.</li> <li>Pull-out instruction for struggling students</li> </ol> | Pam Black, Tom Kaestner, Ron Reed, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Debra Johnson, Christine Henschel, Math Teachers   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check enrollment of students in Intensive Math courses.</li> <li>The math coach and administration will monitor the usage of higher order questions during classroom observations. Department head and math coach will monitor assessments to ensure higher order questions are being utilized.</li> <li>The math coach and department head will work with classroom teachers to implement assessments that are similar in style to those that students will see on the FCAT.</li> <li>The math coach will implement a weekly pull-out schedule where she will target benchmarks that are areas of weakness for students.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master schedule, student schedules, and FCAT scores.</li> <li>Classroom walk-through evaluation tool, lesson plans and classroom assessments.</li> <li>Classroom assessments</li> <li>Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments.</li> </ol> |

|   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement     |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |  |
| In grades 9 and 10, 53% of all black students were proficient in math |   | By May 2010, at least 63% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. |   |  |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will utilize FCAT materials created by strand and benchmark daily.</li> <li>Teachers will be divided into course specific PLCs which meet monthly.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pam Black, Ron Reed, Tom Kaestner, Debra Johnson, Christine Henschel, Wendy Bernstein, and Monty Escabi.</li> <li>Pam Black</li> </ol>          | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The math coach, department head, and administration will monitor the implementation of the FCAT materials. The math coach will provide training for the teachers so that the materials are being utilized appropriately.</li> <li>The math coach will meet with teachers in a PLC format to increase curricular knowledge and share best practices.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre and Post tests, Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments.</li> <li>Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments.</li> </ol> |

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement    |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |  |
| In grades 9 and 10, 40% of all ELL students were proficient in math. |  | By May 2010, at least 50% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test.                                  |   |  |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pull-out instruction for Level 1 and 2 students.</li> <li>Teachers will utilize FCAT materials created by strand and benchmark.</li> <li>Teachers will receive training in successful strategies for use with ELL students</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pam Black and Kathy Lopez.</li> <li>Pam Black, Ron Reed, Tom Kaestner, Debra Johnson, Christine Henschel, Wendy Bernstein, and Monty Escabi.</li> <li>Orkisha Edmond,</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The math coach will work with a retired teacher to provide instruction for students in their native language.</li> <li>The math coach, department head, and administration will monitor the implementation of the</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments.</li> <li>Pre and Post tests, Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments.</li> </ol> |

|  |  |                             |   |  |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|
|  |  | Pam Black, and Monty Escabi | FCAT materials. The math coach will provide training for the teachers so that the materials are being utilized appropriately.<br>3. Students will be periodically assessed to determine if their needs are being met. | 3. Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT I and II, FCAT scores, and classroom assessments. |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |   |
| In grades 11 and 12, 73% of students passed the FCAT Math Retakes |  | By May 2010, at least 85% of 11th and 12th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will pass the FCAT Math retake test |   |   |
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Weekly pull-out instruction for 11th grade students.<br>2. 12th grade students will be placed in a course to provide them with help to pass the FCAT. | 1. Pam Black<br>2. Wendy Bernstein   | 1. The math coach will provide instruction in all strands covered on the FCAT Retake Test.<br>2. Administration will work to register any 12th grade student who has not passed the FCAT or received a concordant score in a FCAT course. | 1. October FCAT Retake test.<br>2. Master schedule and student schedules. |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed  | Content/Topic                             | Facilitator      | Target Date          | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring   | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| By May 2010, at least 78% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. | Technology                                | Elisabeth Jacobi | September - December | Math coach and administration will observe teachers utilizing Promethean Boards in a lesson | Pam Black, Ron Reed               |
| By May 2010, at least 71% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the DOE Accountability Rule will demonstrate annual learning gains in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test.         | Best – Practices/Instructional Strategies | Pam Black        | August - March       | Math coach, department head and administration will monitor during classroom observations   | Pam Black, Tom Kaestner, Ron Reed |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)  |                          |                  |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available Amount |
| No Data  | No Data                  | \$0.00           |
| Total: \$0.00  |                          |                  |
| Technology   |                          |                  |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available Amount |
| No Data  | No Data                  | \$0.00           |
| Total: \$0.00  |                          |                  |
| Professional Development   |                          |                  |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available Amount |
| By May 2010, at least 78% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. | Substitutes General Fund | \$1,000.00       |
| Total: \$1,000.00  |                          |                  |
| Other  |                          |                  |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available Amount |
| No Data  | No Data                  | \$0.00           |
| Total: \$0.00  |                          |                  |
| Final Total: \$1,000.00  |                          |                  |

## Science Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?

What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement                                   |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage of students meeting high standards in Science has remained unchanged at 35% for 2 years. |   | Increase the percentage of students meeting high standards in Science from 35% to 43%.                                |   |   |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Utilize mini benchmarks to further differentiate science curriculum instruction<br>2. Increase the usage of lab experiments in all science classrooms<br>3. 9th, 10th, and 11th grade science classes will work on Science clusters embedded in the curriculum | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed | 1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure that mini-benchmark assessments are offered effectively and in accordance with the curriculum<br>2. Administration and Science coach will conduct classroom observations<br>3. Department head will conduct monthly observations. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs. Science coach will conduct daily classroom observations. | 1. Mini-benchmark assessment tests and FCAT scores<br>2. Classroom walk-through observation tool<br>3. Classroom walk-through observation tool. Mini-benchmark assessments. BAT I and II. |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement  |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Physical and chemical benchmark and earth and space benchmark are both one point below the state average |   | Improve both benchmarks scores to meet or exceed the state average.   |   |   |
|  | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1  | 1. 11th grade science classes will work on Science clusters utilizing daily class starters and a weekly strand focus<br>2. Science teachers will offer tutoring for students either before or after school.<br>3. Instructional focus emphasizes teaching to mastery and integrating standards authentically through course content | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed | 1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure that clusters and weekly strand focus is being met<br>2. Mini-benchmark assessments will be analyzed to determine improvement.<br>3. Department head will conduct monthly observations. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs. Science coach will conduct daily classroom observations. | 1. Mini-benchmark assessment tests, FCAT scores and teacher lesson plans.<br>2. Mini-benchmark assessment tests.<br>3. Teacher assessments, mini-benchmark assessment tests, BAT I and II |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement  |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Science teachers' utilization and integration of technological resources including Broward Enterprise Education Portal (BEEP) is moderate to low (66%) |  | Increase the percentage of teachers accessing BEEP, Learning Village and other technological modalities to enhance science instruction |   |  |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step                                    | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | 1. Offer Ongoing Department –specific Professional Development on effective technology | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile  | 1. Lesson plans and follow up / evaluation form for feedback.<br>2. Best Practice sharing | 1. Classroom observation tool and evaluation<br>2. Meeting minutes, agenda, follow |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| integration in the science classroom<br>2. Provide Best-Practice sharing sessions to improve classroom instruction through technology<br>3. Implement Course-specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for lateral alignment in science lessons |  | session will occur during bimonthly department meetings<br>3. Lesson Study Groups (PLC) will meet bimonthly | up/evaluation and student/teacher survey<br>3. Meeting minutes, agenda, sign-in sheet, follow up/evaluation. |
|--|--|---|--|

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |  |   |
| Student attendance for the Science FCAT in 2009 was 538.          |   | Increase the percentage of 11th grade students present for FCAT Science on the date of administration by 10%                                 |  |   |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Provide ongoing classroom reinforcement to students and teachers<br>2. Identify students with critical needs or obstacles with regards to attendance<br>3. Implement a Science Incentive Program | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed<br>Classroom teachers, | 1. Attendance records and ongoing data chat with teachers<br>2. Attendance records and data chat with teachers<br>3. Science Incentive Program Committee members will garner stakeholder support | 1. Attendance records on day of Science FCAT<br>2. Attendance records prior to and on day of Science FCAT<br>3. Attendance records on day of Science FCAT |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement   |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement   |   |   |
| Science teachers require training on incorporating differentiated instruction and reading strategies in lessons |  | Improve science teachers level of comfort and expertise in differentiated instruction and reading strategies in the science classroom |   |   |
|   | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Provide bimonthly reading strategy workshops<br>2. Identify teachers to attend district reading / instructional strategy workshop[s]<br>3. Utilize district Instructional Focus Calendars and other resources to support implementation | 1. Keisha Maxwell, Orkisha Edmond<br>2. Keisha Maxwell, Orkisha Edmond<br>3. Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, Donna Rose                  | 1. Regular classroom observations and lesson plan review<br>2. Follow up presentation and classroom walkthrough<br>3. Regular classroom observations and lesson plan review | 1. Meeting minutes, agenda, sign-in sheet, follow up/evaluation (model)<br>2. Classroom observation tool<br>3. Classroom observation tool |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed  | Content/Topic                                    | Facilitator                                | Target Date | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring   | Person Responsible for Monitoring   |
|--|--|--|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Increase the percentage of teachers accessing BEEP, Learning Village and other technological modalities to enhance science instruction | Technology Integration                           | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, Guest Speaker | 01/2010     | Classroom Observations/walkthroughs | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed |
| Science teachers require training on incorporating differentiated instruction and reading strategies in lessons                        | Reading Strategies in the Content Area (Science) | Keisha Maxwell, Orkisha Edmond             | 06/2010     | Classroom Observations/walkthroughs | Keisha Maxwell, Jody Berman, David Basile, Wendy Bernstein, Monty Escabi, Christine Henschel, Debra Johnson, Ron Reed |

Budget:

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

| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                | Total: \$0.00       |
| Professional Development |                |                     |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                | Total: \$0.00       |
| Other                    |                |                     |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                | Total: \$0.00       |
|                          |                | Final Total: \$0.00 |

End of Science Goal

## Writing Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on School Grade Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?

What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Students scoring a 3.5 or above is 82%                            |   | Increase number of students scoring a 3.5 or above by 3%   |  |  |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1   | 1. Analyze previous year's writing scores to determine weakest writing skills<br>2. Incorporate writing skills at all grade level curricula<br>3. Utilize research projects to allow enrichment of the curriculum and encourage higher order thinking | 1. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt, classroom teachers.<br>2. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt<br>3. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt | 1. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators<br>2. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators<br>3. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators | 1. FCAT scores<br>2. Writing portfolio<br>3. Research projects |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Students scoring a 4.0 or above is 67%.                           |   | Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5%   |  |   |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1   | 1. Analyze previous year's writing scores to determine weakest writing skills<br>2. Incorporate writing skills at all grade level curricula<br>3. Implement writing portfolios for 9th and 10th graders | 1. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt, classroom teachers.<br>2. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt<br>3. Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt | 1. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators<br>2. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators<br>3. Weekly/monthly monitoring by department heads, administrators | 1. FCAT scores<br>2. Writing portfolio<br>3. Writing portfolios |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed                                      | Content/Topic            | Facilitator        | Target Date    | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring             | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Increase number of students scoring a 3.5 or above by 3% | FCAT Writing Workshop    | District Personnel | September 2009 | Results of English department writing prompts | Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt        |
| Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5% | 6 Trait Writing Workshop | District Personnel | September 2009 | Results of English department writing prompts | Debra Johnson, Debbie Vogt        |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)   |   |                         |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Description of Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount        |
| No Data   | No Data   | \$0.00                  |
|   |   | Total: \$0.00           |
| Technology  |   |                         |
| Description of Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount        |
| No Data   | No Data   | \$0.00                  |
|   |   | Total: \$0.00           |
| Professional Development  |   |                         |
| Description of Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount        |
| Increase number of students scoring a 3.5 or above by 3%- FCAT Writing Workshop   | General Fund  | \$1,000.00              |
| Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5% 6 Trait Writing Workshop | Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5% 6 Trait Writing Workshop | \$1,000.00              |
|   |   | Total: \$2,000.00       |
| Other   |   |                         |
| Description of Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount        |
| No Data   | No Data   | \$0.00                  |
|   |   | Total: \$0.00           |
|   |   | Final Total: \$2,000.00 |

End of Science Goal

## Parent Involvement Goal

Needs Assessment: Based on information from School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:

Were parent involvement activities and strategies targeted to areas of academic need?

Based on information from surveys, evaluations, agendas, or sign-ins:

Was the percent of parent participation in school activities maintained or increased from the prior year?

Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement |   | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement           |  |                      |
|---|---|---|--|----------------------|
| Parent participation in PTSO was 105 during 2008-2009.            |   | Increase membership in the PTSO by 20%            |  |                      |
|   | Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool      |
| 1   | Membership drive at the beginning of the school year. | 1. David Basile, Christine Henschel, Ann Gardiner | Increase in PTSO membership                            | PTSO membership list |

| Based on the Needs Assessment, I identify Area(s) for Improvement                      |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement           |  |                          |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| Increased parental and community involvement through the School Advisory Council (SAC) |  | Increase parent participation in SAC by 25%.      |  |                          |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool          |
| 1  | Identify problem areas, develop an improvement strategy, monitor the implementation, and analyze the results for improvement | David Basile                                      | . Identified problem areas show improvement            | 1. SAC attendance sheets |

|  |  |  |  |                 |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------|
| Based on the Needs Assessment, I Identify Area(s) for Improvement                        |  | Objective Linked to Area of Improvement                                      |  |                 |
| Increased parental understanding of student academic, community and career opportunities |  | Increased parental participation in school provided Professional development |  |                 |
|  | Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step                            | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step | Evaluation Tool |
| 1  | 1. Form parental involvement community<br>2. Identify areas of need<br>3. Publicize events | 1. David Basile Wendy Bernstein Debra Johnson                                | Parental participation                                 | Attendance      |

Professional Development Aligned with Objective:

| Objective Addressed  | Content/Topic                                 | Facilitator                 | Target Date       | Strategy for Follow-up/ Monitoring                               | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Increased parental and community involvement through the School Advisory Council (SAC) | Solicit teacher ideas for the SAC to consider | David Basile, Debra Johnson | August - December | Follow-up communication to staff with areas the SAC will address | David Basile, Debra Johnson       |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)  |   |                          |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| No Data  | No Data   | \$0.00                   |
|  |   | Total: \$0.00            |
| Technology   |   |                          |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| No Data  | No Data   | \$0.00                   |
|  |   | Total: \$0.00            |
| Professional Development   |   |                          |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| No Data  | No Data   | \$0.00                   |
|  |   | Total: \$0.00            |
| Other  |   |                          |
| Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Increased parental understanding of student academic, community and career opportunities | Guest Speakers, publications, food, advertising - Title I | \$12,000.00              |
|  |   | Total: \$12,000.00       |
|  |   | Final Total: \$12,000.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal

# Other Goals

No Other Goals were submitted for this school

## FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |  |   |                          |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Reading                               | Edge Reading Material  | General Fund  | \$8,000.00               |
|                                       |  |   | Total: \$8,000.00        |
| Technology                            |  |   |                          |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| No Data                               | No Data  | No Data   | \$0.00                   |
|                                       |  |   | Total: \$0.00            |
| Professional Development              |  |   |                          |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Reading                               | Reduce the number of students below grade level in Reading by 5%   | CRISS Training - General Fund   | \$2,000.00               |
| Reading                               | Staff Development Material   | General Fund  | \$500.00                 |
| Mathematics                           | By May 2010, at least 78% of 9th and 10th grade students, meeting the criteria for the DOE Accountability Rule, will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the FCAT SSS Math Test. | Substitutes General Fund  | \$1,000.00               |
| Writing                               | Increase number of students scoring a 3.5 or above by 3%- FCAT Writing Workshop  | General Fund  | \$1,000.00               |
| Writing                               | Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5% 6 Trait Writing Workshop  | Increase number of students scoring a 4.0 or above by 5% 6 Trait Writing Workshop | \$1,000.00               |
|                                       |  |   | Total: \$5,500.00        |
| Other                                 |  |   |                          |
| Goal                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Parental Involvement                  | Increased parental understanding of student academic, community and career opportunities   | Guest Speakers, publications, food, advertising - Title I                         | \$12,000.00              |
|                                       |  |   | Total: \$12,000.00       |
|                                       |  |   | Final Total: \$25,500.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

|                                    |                                     |                                     |                                    |                                    |                             |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Intervene | <input type="checkbox"/> Correct II | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent II | <input type="checkbox"/> Correct I | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent I | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

[Show Attached school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance](#)

## 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 |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Saturday Camp              | 8000   |
| After-school tutoring      | 5000   |

Describe the Activities of the School Advisory Council for the Upcoming Year

Saturday Camp

## SAC Members

### Members

- 1) David Basile, Principal
  - 2) Tracie Casserly, SAC Chair
  - 3) Lisa Tran, Student
  - 4) Mikayla Vielot, Student
  - 5) Pamela Krauss, Teacher
  - 6) Karen James, Teacher
  - 7) James McGonigle, Business Member
  - 8) David Hepler, Parent
  - 9) Kay Arnold, Parent
  - 10) Janet Chrystie-Wargula, Parent
  - 11) Lynne Drummings, Parent
  - 12) Nereida Miller, Parent
  - 13) Darlene Vlazny, Community Member
  - 14) Marlen Zarcone, School Support Personnel
  - 15) Orkisha Edmond, School Support Personnel
  - 16) Susan Steege, Union Steward
-

# AYP DATA

| 2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Broward SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL 2351   |  |  |                     |   |      |  |  |      |                      |   |     |                   |     |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|-----|---|------|---|--|--|---------------------|---|------|--|--|------|----------------------|---|-----|-------------------|-----|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><b>Click here to see Number of students in each group</b>            |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Read: 1299<br>Math: 1292  |  | 2008-2009<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : D |                     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? |      | NO   |  |      |                      |   |     |                   |     |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |  |  |                     |   |      | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |  |      |                      |   |     |                   |     |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 65% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 68% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      |     | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      |   | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |  | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |      | Safe Harbor Math   | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |      | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |     | Growth model math |     |
|   | 2009                                | Y/N | 2009                             | Y/N | 2009  | Y/N | 2009   | Y/N | 2008                                   | 2009 | Y/N | 2007  | 2008 | Y/N   | 2008   | 2009                                       | Y/N                 | 2008  | 2009 | Y/N  | 2008   | 2009 | Y/N                  | 2009  | Y/N | 2009              | Y/N |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 40  | N   | 70   | Y   | 91                                     | 94   | Y   | 77  | 73   | N   | 60   | 60   | N                   | 32  | 30   | NA   | 40   | N    | 71                   | NA  |     |                   |     |
| WHITE   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 63  | N   | 91   | Y   |  |      | Y   | 85  | 78   | N   | 37   | 37   | N                   | 13  | 9    | NA   | 63   | N    | 91                   | NA  |     |                   |     |
| BLACK   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 25  | N   | 53   | N   | 87                                     | 91   | Y   | 70  | 70   | N   | 75   | 75   | N                   | 46  | 47   | NA   | 24   | N    | 54                   | N   |     |                   |     |
| HISPANIC  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 34  | N   | 68   | Y   | 91                                     | 94   | Y   | 84  | 72   | N   | 61   | 66   | N                   | 31  | 32   | NA   | 33   | N    | 70                   | NA  |     |                   |     |
| ASIAN   | 100                                 | Y   | 100                              | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |      |                      |   |     |                   |     |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |      |                      |   |     |                   |     |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 28  | N   | 58   | N   | 88                                     | 90   | Y   | 72  | 68   | N   | 73   | 72   | N                   | 42  | 42   | NA   | 27   | N    | 59                   | N   |     |                   |     |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 100                                 | Y   | 99                               | Y   | 10  | N   | 40   | N   | 69                                     | 78   | Y   | 66  | 53   | N   | 88   | 90   | N                   | 70  | 60   | N  | 11   | N    | 45                   | N   |     |                   |     |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 96                                  | Y   | 95                               | Y   | 27  | N   | 53   | N   | 71                                     | 79   | Y   | 31  | 32   | N   | 74   | 73   | N                   | 56  | 47   | N  | 26   | N    | 46                   | N   |     |                   |     |

| 2007-2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Broward SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL 2351   |  |  |                     |   |      |  |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|-----|---|------|---|--|--|---------------------|---|------|--|--|-----|----------------------|---|------|-------------------|--|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><b>Click here to see Number of students in each group</b>            |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Read: 1488<br>Math: 1484  |  | 2007-2008<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : C |                     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? |      | NO   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |  |  |                     |   |      | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 58% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 62% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      |     | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      |   | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |  | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |      | Safe Harbor Math   | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |     | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |      | Growth model math |  |
|   | 2008                                | Y/N | 2008                             | Y/N | 2008  | Y/N | 2008   | Y/N | 2007                                   | 2008 | Y/N | 2006  | 2007 | Y/N   | 2007   | 2008                                       | Y/N                 | 2007  | 2008 | Y/N  | 2008   | Y/N | 2008                 | Y/N   | 2008 | Y/N               |  |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 40  | N   | 68   | Y   | 89                                     | 91   | Y   | 67  | 77   | Y   | 61   | 60   | N                   | 36  | 32   | NA   | 44   | N   | 78                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| WHITE   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 63  | Y   | 87   | Y   |  |      | Y   | 78  | 85   | Y   | 39   | 37   | NA                  | 15  | 13   | NA   | 63   | NA  | 90                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| BLACK   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 25  | N   | 54   | N   | 85                                     | 87   | Y   | 60  | 70   | Y   | 77   | 75   | N                   | 52  | 46   | Y  | 30   | N   | 68                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| HISPANIC  | 97                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   | 39  | N   | 69   | Y   | 88                                     | 91   | Y   | 64  | 84   | Y   | 65   | 61   | N                   | 38  | 31   | NA   | 46   | N   | 78                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| ASIAN   | 100                                 | Y   | 100                              | Y   |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 27  | N   | 58   | N   | 85                                     | 88   | Y   | 56  | 72   | Y   | 75   | 73   | N                   | 48  | 42   | Y  | 32   | N   | 72                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 12  | N   | 30   | N   | 56                                     | 69   | Y   | 54  | 66   | Y   | 89   | 88   | N                   | 68  | 70   | N  | 27   | N   | 56                   | N   |      |                   |  |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 97                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   | 26  | N   | 44   | N   | 70                                     | 71   | Y   | 30  | 31   | Y   | 86   | 74   | Y                   | 63  | 56   | Y  | 33   | NA  | 55                   | NA  |      |                   |  |

| 2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2  |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Broward SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL 2351   |  |  |                     |   |      |  |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|------|-----|---|------|---|--|--|---------------------|---|------|--|--|-----|----------------------|---|------|-------------------|--|
| Number of students enrolled in the grades tested:<br><b>Click here to see Number of students in each group</b>            |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | Read: 1435<br>Math: 1430  |  | 2006-2007<br>School Grade <sup>1</sup> : C |                     | Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress? |      | NO   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ). |                                     |     |                                  |     |   |     |  |     |  |      |     |   |      | This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ). |  |  |                     |   |      | This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model. |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| Group   | Reading Tested 95% of the students? |     | Math Tested 95% of the students? |     | 51% scoring at or above grade level in Reading? |     | 56% scoring at or above grade level in Math? |     | Improved performance in Writing by 1%? |      |     | Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%? |      |   | Percent of Students below grade level in Reading |  | Safe Harbor Reading | Percent of Students below grade level in Math |      | Safe Harbor Math   | % of students on track to be proficient in reading |     | Growth model reading | % of students on track to be proficient in math |      | Growth model math |  |
|   | 2007                                | Y/N | 2007                             | Y/N | 2007  | Y/N | 2007   | Y/N | 2006                                   | 2007 | Y/N | 2005  | 2006 | Y/N   | 2006   | 2007                                       | Y/N                 | 2006  | 2007 | Y/N  | 2007   | Y/N | 2007                 | Y/N   | 2007 | Y/N               |  |
| TOTAL <sup>4</sup>  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 39  | N   | 64   | Y   | 89                                     | 89   | N   | 66  | 67   | Y   | 61   | 61   | NA                  | 32  | 36   | NA   | 47   | NA  | 76                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| WHITE   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 61  | Y   | 85   | Y   | 92                                     |      | Y   | 75  | 78   | Y   | 39   | 39   | NA                  | 15  | 15   | NA   | 62   | NA  | 85                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| BLACK   | 97                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   | 23  | N   | 48   | N   | 84                                     | 85   | Y   | 58  | 60   | Y   | 78   | 77   | NA                  | 48  | 52   | NA   | 35   | NA  | 70                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| HISPANIC  | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 35  | N   | 62   | Y   | 91                                     | 88   | N   | 58  | 64   | Y   | 58   | 65   | NA                  | 24  | 38   | NA   | 48   | NA  | 75                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| ASIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| AMERICAN INDIAN   |                                     | NA  |                                  | NA  |   | NA  |  | NA  |  |      |     |   |      | NA  |  |  |                     |   |      | NA   |  |     |                      |   |      |                   |  |
| ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  | 97                                  | Y   | 97                               | Y   | 25  | N   | 52   | N   | 85                                     | 85   | N   | 57  | 56   | N   | 73   | 75   | NA                  | 38  | 48   | NA   | 36   | NA  | 71                   | NA  |      |                   |  |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS   | 98                                  | Y   | 98                               | Y   | 11  | N   | 32   | N   | 73                                     | 56   | N   | 49  | 54   | Y   |  | 89   | NA                  | 53  | 68   | NA   |  | NA  |                      | NA  |      |                   |  |
| STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES  | 88                                  | N   | 88                               | N   | 14  | N   | 37   | N   | 56                                     | 70   | Y   | 31  | 30   | N   | 84   | 86   | NA                  | 74  | 63   | NA   |  | NA  |                      | NA  |      |                   |  |

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

| Broward School District<br>SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL<br>2008-2009 |         |      |         |         |                     |   |
|--|---------|------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
|  | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)                    | 42%     | 73%  | 86%     | 35%     | 236                 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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%     | 77%  |         |         | 127                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within</li> </ul>  |

|  |          |           |  |  |     |  |
|--|----------|-----------|--|--|-----|--|
|  |          |           |  |  |     | Level 1 or 2   |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?                                   | 44% (NO) | 66% (YES) |  |  | 110 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| % of 11th and 12th graders meeting the graduation requirement on the FCAT retake | 53%      | 73%       |  |  | 10  | If 50% of 11th and 12th graders meet the graduation requirement on the retake in both reading and math, ten bonus points are awarded     |
| Points Earned  |          |           |  |  | 483 |  |
| Percent Tested = 97%   |          |           |  |  |     | Percent of eligible students tested  |
| School Grade   |          |           |  |  | D   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested   |

|  |          |           |         |         |                     |   |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| Broward School District<br>SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL<br>2007-2008             |          |           |         |         |                     |   |
|  | Reading  | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)                                | 43%      | 72%       | 84%     | 35%     | 234                 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>   |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?                                   | 45% (NO) | 70% (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.  |
| % of 11th and 12th graders meeting the graduation requirement on the FCAT retake | 49%      | 75%       |         |         | 0                   | If 50% of 11th and 12th graders meet the graduation requirement on the retake in both reading and math, ten bonus points are awarded  |
| Points Earned  |          |           |         |         | 477                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 98%   |          |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade   |          |           |         |         | C                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

|  |          |           |         |         |                     |   |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| Broward School District<br>SOUTH PLANTATION HIGH SCHOOL<br>2006-2007             |          |           |         |         |                     |   |
|  | Reading  | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)                                | 41%      | 67%       | 78%     | 40%     | 226                 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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%      | 71%       |         |         | 119                 | 3 ways to make gains:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>   |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?                                   | 38% (NO) | 65% (YES) |         |         | 103                 | 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.  |
| % of 11th and 12th graders meeting the graduation requirement on the FCAT retake | 52%      | 39%       |         |         | 0                   | If 50% of 11th and 12th graders meet the graduation requirement on the retake in both reading and math, ten bonus points are awarded  |
| Points Earned  |          |           |         |         | 448                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 98%   |          |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade   |          |           |         |         | C                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |