FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SECOND CHANCE SCHOOL-SOPCHOPPY EDUCATION CENTER

District Name: Wakulla

Principal: Thomas Askins

SAC Chair: Tim O'Donnell

Superintendent: David Miller

Date of School Board Approval: November 19, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/7/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Thomas Askins	BS Business, MS Ed Administration, PhD Ed. Leadership -Certified Building Level Principal	8	40	Prior to coming to SEC, served as Principal of Coast Charter School which went from a D to an A during his tenure.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
N/A					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Partner new teachers with veteran staff members.	Principal	On-going	
2	Regular meetings of new teacher with principal.	Principal	On-going	
3	Work with District Human Resources Department to recruit the best teachers for the program.	Principal	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
4	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	100.0%(4)	50.0%(2)	100.0%(4)	25.0%(1)	0.0%(0)	50.0%(2)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Joyce Ashburn	Brenda Eaton	Teacher is new to Wakulla system in the position as a teacher; both are teaching ESE students	Frequent data analysis and conferencing

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Thomas Askins, Principal
Brenda Eaton, ESE Teacher
Joyce Ashburn, Reading Teacher
David Carraway, Regular Ed Teacher
Tim O'Donnell, Regular Ed Teacher

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

Weekly all the members meet and discuss student progress. If a student has been identified as needing intervention, the students area(s) of need are discussed at the meeting and a parent contact is made by the principal and a Parent Notification of Intervention Activities/Screening is sent to the parent.

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

During the weekly meetings the team discusses students and school needs and identify the goals for the school improvement plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Reading: FAIR (Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading) will be administered three times during the year. At grades K-8 all students will take the Broad Screen and the Broad Diagnostic Inventory, with targeted student being assessed with the Targeted Diagnostic Inventory. All data is entered into the PMRN (Progress Monitoring Reporting Network). Disaggregated data reports are then available to administrators, teachers and coaches to use in planning for instruction. Ongoing progress monitoring is utilized for Tier II and Tier III students between the assessment windows. This is also a part of FAIR. (At the high school level the above is available for FCAT Level 1 and 2 students.)

Math: Grades K-8 will administer the online STAR math to all students assessment fall, winter, and spring for progress monitoring. This data is accessible through the STAR Math website. Tier II and Tier III students will be given the GMADE from Pearson to determine specific needs in math instruction. This is a paper/pencil group administered math diagnostic. It is available for grades K-12. High School Tier I students will be progress monitored through their math classes. Detailed progress monitoring information is updated each nine weeks.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All personnel are required to complete a five-hour online Response to Intervention module. School-based RtI district team members will work with faculties to orient them to the district and school plans. A teacher packet has been created and is available to all teachers on the district website. Ongoing training will occur throughout the school year with some utilization of early release days. In addition, the school Intervention Support Team will serve as a training forum for teachers who are working with Tier II and Tier III students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Thomas Askins, Principal
Joyce Ashburn, Reading Teacher
Brenda Eaton, ESE Teacher

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

Help faculty with the following: analysis of student reading data; FAIR testing; interdisciplinary reading strategies.

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

Improve student reading performance on the FCAT.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

One-on-one tutoring is available for all students. Reading strategies such as text walks, outlining, defining vocabulary, main idea identification, and study guides.

*High Schools Only

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

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

Students have the same teacher for several subjects, so courses are integrated with each other and made relevant through career education discussions and research.

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?

Independent student research is a component of the Second Chance curriculum, including research about career planning. Educators and entities from outside the school system work with students about their futures, such as the National Guard representative who works on leadership skills with students.

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

Students are following a route to be college ready if they stay at the school through 11th or 12th grade through the Math for College Readiness course and the English for College Readiness course.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Increase students scoring at Level 3 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (4) scored Level 3 or higher; 50% scored Level 2; 17% scored Level 1	39% of all students enrolled for both FTE counts will achieve proficiency (Level 3 or higher) for the 2012-2013 school year to meet the AMO target.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.
2	Sopchoppy Education Center is a second chance school. The population is fluid as a function of the school's normal processes.	Reading strategies stressed using all subject areas.	Dr. Askins	Data analysis of FAIR assessments	FCAT Reading

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Special diploma students will maintain high scores on the Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The one student enrolled in special diploma classes scored a Level 8 in Reading. 100% (1) of students.	100% of students should also score high on the Alternate Assessment in 2012-2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students might not be in the program for an entire school year.	Formative assessments to help student and teacher know where the	Principal	Daily and weekly progress as assessed on classroom assignments	Textbook and computer program assessments

		student needs the most help.			

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Reading strategies across the disciplines will be stressed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
25% (3) scored Level 4 or 5 in Reading.	31% of students will achieve Level 4 or 5 in Reading.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Not having student for entire school year</td><td>Pairing advanced students together and using the computer credit recovery system to get high achieving students back on track to return to their home school</td><td>Principal</td><td>Data analysis of computer credit recovery reports</td><td>On-going assessments on each unit in credit recovery courses</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Second Chance School is used as a Tier II or Tier III intervention for many struggling readers.</td><td>Reading strategies will be used across the disciplines.</td><td>Dr. Askins</td><td>Analysis of data including FAIR and FCAT scores.</td><td>FAIR, FCAT</td></tr>
</table>

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Students on special diploma will continue to show achievement on the Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
100% (1) proficient.	100% proficiency.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Not having student for the entire year</td><td>Pair higher functioning students together. Use small groups and individualized instruction.</td><td>Principal</td><td>Data analysis from ongoing assessments</td><td>Textbook and computerized credit recovery program assessments.</td></tr>
</table>

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	Students often come to Second Chance reading one or more grades below their grade level. Many are retained.

	Reading Goal #3a:	Improvement is needed to help students comprehend and analyze text that is non-fiction.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	33% (4) made learning gains in Reading.	39% or more of students will make learning gains in Reading to meet the AMO target.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire school year	Use small group and individualized instruction, plus computer credit recovery program	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	FAIR; textbook and computer credit recovery assessments
2	Sopchoppy Education Center is a second chance school. The population is fluid as a function of the school's normal processes.	Reading strategies across the disciplines will be stressed.	Dr. Askins	Analysis of ongoing data and frequent staff collaboration.	FAIR, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Students taking the Alternate Assessment will continue to be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year	Small group and individualized instruction, plus individualized computer credit recovery program	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	Ongoing textbook and computer credit recovery assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Students in the lowest 25% from their previous year will continue to receive the individual attention that this program provides.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (1) of students in the lowest 25% had a learning gain.	14% need to make a learning gain to meet the AMO target.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for entire school year; also, some students come to this program already having been unsuccessful with interventions at the school of origin	Small group and individualized instruction; use of individualized computer credit recovery program	Principal	Data analysis of ongoing assessments	Textbook and computer program assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #
	At least 39% of students will achieve a Reading level of 3 or higher in 2012-2013.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	33%	39%	48%	60%	75%	

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

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

Reading Goal #5B:	Students in every subgroup will be worked with on an individual basis to improve their reading skills.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not enough students in any sub-category except white to make a cell. All students can improve from the 33% total who showed proficiency in Reading.	The goal is 39% of students meeting the AMO target in Reading.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year; also, some students come to the program having been unsuccessful with interventions at their school of origin	Work with students in small groups; individualize instruction; use individualized computer credit recovery program; reteach skills students are missing to perform at grade level	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	FAIR; textbook and computer program assessments; mid-year math assessment through district-wide uniform assessment in Algebra 1 and Geometry
2	Sopchoppy Education Center is a second chance school. The population is fluid as a function of the school's normal processes.	Use reading strategies used across the disciplines.	Dr. Askins	Frequent analysis of data and teacher collaboration on each student's progress.	FAIR, FCAT, teacher-made tests

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Accommodations for Students with Disabilities will continue to be implemented with fidelity.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not enough in this sub-group to form a cell, but 33% of all students were proficient.	Not enough in this sub-group to form a cell, but 39% of all students will be proficient to meet the 39% AMO target.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student may be enrolled for entire year; also some students have already been unsuccessful with additional help given at school of origin	Small group and individualized instruction; reteach skills missing to perform on grade level; individualized computer credit recovery program; review accommodations and modifications use for each student on a regular basis	Principal	Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments	FAIR; classroom, textbook, and computer assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Tier II and Tier III reading interventions will continue to be used.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not enough students to make a cell, but 33% overall showed proficiency.	Not enough students to make a cell, but 39% of student will show proficiency to meet the AMO target.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	This population has the highest percentage of ED students in the district; barriers include some lack of parental participation and oversight, in terms of students getting right medication on a regular basis if needed, enough sleep, and/or proper nutrition when not at school	Teachers try to make sure students eat breakfast and lunch at school, are properly medicated if needed, work with them in small groups and individualize instruction.	Principal	Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments	Classroom, textbook, and computer assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Endorsement and Reading CARPD courses	Grades 6-12	PAEC and District	Subject area teachers	Ongoing	Clssroom observations of strategies used in the classroom	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide substitutes for teachers to attend Reading workshops	Reading specialist/reading materials for struggling readers (REWARDS program, etc.)	School general budget	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide students with many opportunities for online learning so they will be prepared for online testing.	Online Credit Recovery program that includes individual lessons for students' areas in need of improvement.	District teacher training in the summer (3 days x 3 people)	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide substitutes for teachers to attend Reading workshops	Reading specialist/reading materials for struggling readers (REWARDS program, etc.)	School general budget	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	**$2,000.00**

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
N/A	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
N/A				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	66% or higher of all students (present during both FTE counts) will be on grade level for math in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%(6) scored Level 3 or 4 in Math.	66% of students will score Level 3 or above in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	Students on special diploma will continue to receive individualized instruction and score Level 4 or higher on the Alternative Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100%

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Students will improve their math scores with the help of individualized instruction.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	10% (1) of the students who took the Math FCAT scored a Level 4.	16% or more will score a Level 4 to meet the 2013 AMO target.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students usually do not attend all year, so the population is fluid.	Continue math tutoring on an individual basis.	Dr. Askins	Improvement on math interim tests and final exams.	FCAT, End of Course Exams

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Students on special diploma will continue to be successful on the Alternate Assessment through individualized instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year	Pair higher functioning students together. Use small groups and individualized instruction.	Principal	Data analysis from ongoing assessments	Textbook and computerized credit recovery program assessments.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Increase number of students making one year's worth of growth in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%(4) made learning gains.	46% or more will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Not having student for	Use small group and	Principal	Data analysis of	FAIR; textbook and

1	the entire school year	individualized instruction, plus computer credit recovery program		assessments	computer credit recovery assessments
2	Students are not usually assigned for the full year.	Continue working with students on an individual basis.	Dr. Askins	Teacher analysis of interim progress.	FCAT, End of Course Exams

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Students will achieve at Level 5 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	Students will achieve at Level 5 or above.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year	Small group and individualized instruction, plus individualized computer credit recovery program	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	Ongoing textbook and computer credit recovery assessments

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	50% of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (4) students	50% of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for entire school year; also, some students come to this program already having been unsuccessful with interventions at the school of origin	Small group and individualized instruction; use of individualized computer credit recovery program	Principal	Data analysis of ongoing assessments	Textbook and computer program assessments

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

<div align="center">Middle School Mathematics Goal #</div>

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Goal is 66% of middle school students showing proficiency (Level 3 or higher) for 2012-2013
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60%	66%	69%	72%	75%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	District target for all groups is 68%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% for District. Not enough in subgroups for an average.	68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year; also, some students come to the program having been unsuccessful with interventions at their school of origin	Work with students in small groups; individualize instruction; use individualized computer credit recovery program; reteach skills students are missing to perform at grade level	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	FAIR; textbook and computer program assessments; mid-year math assessment through district-wide uniform assessment in Algebra 1 and Geometry

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The goal is for SWD to meet the district math proficiency goal of 49%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not enough students in this cell, but the district proficiency rate is 37% for 2012.	49% proficient for 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student may be enrolled for entire year; also some students have already been unsuccessful with additional help given at school of origin	Small group and individualized instruction; reteach skills missing to perform on grade level; individualized computer credit recovery program; review accommodations and modifications use for each student on a regular basis	Principal	Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments	FAIR; classroom, textbook, and computer assessments

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The goal is the district goal of 59% proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not enough students in this cell, but the district rate was 55% proficient.	59% proficient

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	This population has the highest percentage of ED students in the district; barriers include some lack of parental participation and oversight, in terms of students getting right medication on a regular basis if needed, enough sleep, and/or proper nutrition when not at school	Teachers try to make sure students eat breakfast and lunch at school, are properly medicated if needed, work with them in small groups and individualize instruction.	Principal	Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments	Classroom, textbook, and computer assessments

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	100% of students taking the Alternate Assessment will score Level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100%

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:	100%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Often students do not spend the entire year in this program.	Individualize instruction.	Principal	Analyze interim assessment results	Textbook and computer generated assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	100%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	100%

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

<div align="center">No Data Submitted</div>

High School Mathematics AMO Goals

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Mathematics Goal # 29% proficient by 2017 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	17%	20%	23%	26%	29%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	47%

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%	47%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not having student for the entire year; also, some students come to the program having been unsuccessful with interventions at their school of origin	Work with students in small groups; individualize instruction; use individualized computer credit recovery program; reteach skills students are missing to perform at grade level	Principal	Data analysis of assessments	FAIR; textbook and computer program assessments; mid-year math assessment through district-wide uniform assessment in Algebra 1 and Geometry

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

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

Mathematics Goal #5C:		

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>N/A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	49%

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% district	49%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Student may be enrolled for entire year; also some students have already been unsuccessful with additional help given at school of origin</td><td>Small group and individualized instruction; reteach skills missing to perform on grade level; individualized computer credit recovery program; review accommodations and modifications use for each student on a regular basis</td><td>Principal</td><td>Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments</td><td>FAIR; classroom, textbook, and computer assessments</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	59%

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% district	59%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Person or</td><td>Process Used to</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	This population has the highest percentage of ED students in the district; barriers include some lack of parental participation and oversight, in terms of students getting right medication on a regular basis if needed, enough sleep, and/or proper nutrition when not at school	Teachers try to make sure students eat breakfast and lunch at school, are properly medicated if needed, work with them in small groups and individualize instruction.	Principal	Data analysis of classroom, textbook, and computer assessments	Classroom, textbook, and computer assessments

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	23% or more will pass the Algebra 1 EOC on the first attempt.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (1) passed the Algebra 1 EOC.	23% or more will pass the Algebra 1 EOC on the first attempt.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The goal is 6% of students scoring Level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	6%

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may not be assigned to school for an entire school year.	Use common pacing guide and uniform semester one exam in all district schools.	Principal	Analysis of semester one exam results and other assessments before final EOC exam	Algebra 1 EOC exam

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	25%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A. No students took this exam in 2012.	25%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.
2	Lack of math foundational skills	Individualize instruction; use common pacing guide and semester one exam throughout district.	Principal	Data analysis of ongoing assessments	Geometry EOC exam

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	10%

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional development as offered by other middle schools that SEC teachers can attend	Grades 6-8	TBD	Subject area teacher	Ongoing	Data analysis of teacher and textbook assessments	Principal
Algebra 1 and Geometry pacing guides and uniform semester exam professional development	Grades 9-10	Executive Director of Curriculum	Subject area teacher	Pre-planning (August) and mid-year (January)	Data analysis of uniform semester one exam results	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Individualized instruction	State adopted texts and supplemental resources	Textbook allocation	$2,000.00
		Subtotal: $2,000.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Computer assisted instruction	Credit recovery computerized program	District funded	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common pacing and midterm workshops	Teachers within district	General budget for substitutes	$300.00
		Subtotal: $300.00	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Grand Total: $2,300.00			

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	50% of students taking the FCAT Science will achieve Level 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	50%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low number of students- due to fluid population.	Students work on state prepared materials immediately preceding the FCAT testing period. Using science and math materials, students do practice work in a test taking environment. The teacher then reviews with the students the correct answers and strategies for solving the problem.	Dr. Askins	Orientation and placement data	FCAT and end of course exams

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	100% of students will score a 4 or better on the Alternate Assessment in Science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100%

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	10% of students will score a Level 4
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students might not attend Second Chance for the entire year.	Encourage scientific thought processes using new textbooks.	Principal	Interim and final exams	FCAT Science

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	50% will score a Level 7 or above
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	50%

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology. Biology Goal #1:	100% will be proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100% of students will be proficient

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology. Biology Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Meet with other teachers in district to discuss pacing and uniform assessments	Grades 6-8	TBD	Subject area teachers	Ongoing	Data analysis of student performance on assessments	Principal
Biology - Professional development on textbooks and supplemental materials	Grade 10	TBD	Subject area teacher	Ongoing	Data analysis of student performance on assessments	Principal

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	50% will score a Level 4 or higher
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% scored a Level 4	50% will score a Level 4 or higher

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The fluid population of SEC.	Students will take Wakulla Writes and be taught writing strategies using the Six Traits of Writing.	Principal	Analysis of writing practice tests (Wakulla Writes)	FCAT Writing Test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	100%

Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not usually attending for a full school year.	Individualize student instruction	Principal	Analysis of student writing samples	Alternate Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Six Traits of Writing Training	Grades 6-12	Executive Director of Curriculum	Subject area teachers	Early Release and other professional development days	Principal observations	Principal

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Six Traits of Writing strategies	In district trainer	General budget for substitutes	$200.00
		Subtotal: $200.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Grand Total: $200.00			

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	Goal is for new Civics curriculum to be taught with fidelity and teachers to follow pacing guide and use same semester exams districtwide.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	No Civics EOC test for 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	Goal is for new Civics curriculum to be taught with fidelity and same pacing guide and semester exams used district wide.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	No Civics EOC for 2013

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Work with other district Civics teachers on pacing guides and uniform exams	Grade 7	Executive Director of Curriculum	Civics teachers	Pre-planning (August) and mid-year (January)	Analysis of student performance on common assessments	Principal

Civics Budget:

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	60% of students will score at Level 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	60% of students will score at Level 3
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The student population is fluid, since this school is needed as a Tier II and Tier III intervention, as well as a zero tolerance change of placement. Not having a student for the entire school year is a barrier.	Sending schools will provide more data to the Second Chance School through the use of the RtI process. Teachers will use small group and one-on-one tutoring.	Principal	Data analysis of student progress on ongoing assessments	FAIR testing, textbook assessments, state assessments.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	20% of students will score at Level 4
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	20% of students will score at Level 4

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
District wide workshops for all U.S. History teachers to work on pacing guides and same semester one exam	Grade 11	Executive Director of Curriculum	U.S. History teachers	Pre-planning and Early Release days	Teachers will get back together to analyze test results from first semester exam to prepare for End of Course exam.	Executive Director of Curriculum

U.S. History Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher workshops on pacing guides and creating uniform semester one exam	Textbooks and supplements	General	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $100.00

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	80% of all students will have less than 3 days unexcused absences each 9 weeks during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
70%	80%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
15	less than 10
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
5	2

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Need for more parental involvement with excessively absent students.	All parents/guardians will be notified via e-mail or phone call each day a student is absent.	Principal	Attendance data	Attendance data

1		Truant students will be referred to CCYS for student and parent counseling and strategies for attendance improvement.			

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Research successful attendance strategies	Grades 6-12	Lead teacher	All teachers	Ongoing	Analysis of attendance data	Principal

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	SEC will decrease its current suspension rates.

2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
102	85 or less
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
40	25 or less
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
33	25 or less
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
21	15 or less

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Sopchoppy is a second chance school and is an alternative to suspension or expulsion. As a function of the school and behavior plan, suspensions are sometimes necessary.	Parent contact for all suspensions. Use of an Intervention Room for students to complete work; positive behavior rewards	Principal	Intervention and suspension reports from Focus	Referral data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support strategies	Grades 6-12	PBS facilitator	All teachers	Ongoing	Analysis of suspension data	Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	The goal is to have no students drop out of school to explore alternatives such as Adult Education.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
Rates not available yet.	Expected dropout rate is 4%.
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:
Data not available yet.	85% graduation rate expected.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many Second Chance students have little or no parental support at home. Several do not have a parent or a sibling who has graduated from high school.	Continue to develop goal-setting skills in students through such means as: career counseling; GED and Adult Education options information; behavior counseling; leadership activites	Principal	Reduction in dropout rate; increase in graduation and promotion rates	Dropout rate; graduation rate; promotion rate

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Research successful dropout prevention programs	Grades 6-12	Principal	All teachers	Ongoing	Analysis of dropout data	Principal

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	All parents of Second Chance students will be well informed as to the academic and especially the behavioral status of their student through progress reports (every 4.5 weeks) and on the report cards (9 weeks) and after a student has been given a referral.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

	Each student and his custodial parent participate in a detailed orientation, one-on-one, with the principal before being enrolled at SEC. No student shall be enrolled prior to that initial communication.	All students and parents/guardians will complete an on site orientation with the principal prior to enrollment at SEC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Getting parents/guardians involved with the classroom and school	Invite parents to the end of the 9 weeks reward period.	Principal	Number of parents or volunteers signed in during the school year	Volunteer sign in sheets

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Research successful parent involvement strategies	Grades 6-12	Lead teacher	All teachers	Ongoing	Document improvement in parent involvement	Principal

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase the rigor of the science and math curricula with use of pacing guides and semester exams that are used in all district schools.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are often not attending for the entire year.	Individualized and small group instruction	Principal	Analysis of assessment and assignment results throughout the year	End of Course and FCAT assessments

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	Students will be given the opportunity to research careers and the training needed to attain them.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are often not in attendance at SEC for the entire year.	Give students access to computers for research on careers	Principal	Student reports	Student reports

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

Subtotal: $0.00

Grand Total: $0.00

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide substitutes for teachers to attend Reading workshops	Reading specialist/reading materials for struggling readers (REWARDS program, etc.)	School general budget	$500.00
Mathematics	Individualized instruction	State adopted texts and supplemental resources	Textbook allocation	$2,000.00
Writing	Six Traits of Writing strategies	In district trainer	General budget for substitutes	$200.00
				Subtotal: $2,700.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide students with many opportunities for online learning so they will be prepared for online testing.	Online Credit Recovery program that includes individual lessons for students' areas in need of improvement.	District teacher training in the summer (3 days x 3 people)	$1,000.00
Mathematics	Computer assisted instruction	Credit recovery computerized program	District funded	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide substitutes for teachers to attend Reading workshops	Reading specialist/reading materials for struggling readers (REWARDS program, etc.)	School general budget	$500.00
Mathematics	Common pacing and midterm workshops	Teachers within district	General budget for substitutes	$300.00
U.S. History	Teacher workshops on pacing guides and creating uniform semester one exam	Textbooks and supplements	General	$100.00
				Subtotal: $900.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $4,600.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ⓘ Priority   ⓘ Focus   ⓘ Prevent   ⓘ NA

Are you a reward school: ⓘ Yes ⓘ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Any funding will be used towards professional development outlined in the School Improvement Plan.	$2,000.00

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

The SAC will meet on a periodic basis to review school goals and assess progress towards those goals.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found