

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SEBASTIAN CHARTER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

District Name: Indian River

Principal: Martha McAdams

SAC Chair: Ang Dong

Superintendent: Frances Adams

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/27/2012

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	Martha McAdams	Ph. D Administration/Supervision; Specific Learning Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Mentally Handicapped; Varying Exceptionalities; Elementary Education; ESOL	10.5	20.5	"A School" for 7 years A 2011/12 A 2010/11 A 2009/10; A 2008/09; A 2007/08; A 2006/07; A 2005/06
Assis Principal	Alison Taylor	M.Ed. Administration Science 5-9	9	1	A 2011-12

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.

Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted				

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	Ongoing Professional development on site	Martha McAdams	May 2013	
2	Competitive salaries and health benefits	Ang Dong	November 2012	
3	Teachers involved in decision making	Martha McAdams	On-going	
4	Dynamic and interactive curriculum	Martha McAdams and Staff	On-going	
5	Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Martha McAdams	On-going	
6	Partnering new teachers with experienced staff as mentors	Martha McAdams	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
13	0.0%(0)	46.2%(6)	30.8%(4)	23.1%(3)	53.8%(7)	100.0%(13)	7.7%(1)	0.0%(0)	15.4%(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
Alison Taylor	Susi Durand	Certification and expertise; Returning teacher to our school and has some experience in the use of the SIM and our school's specific procedures	Meetings and in-service activities The mentor and mentee are meeting periodically in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies, specifically the Strategic Instructional Model Learning Strategies and Content Enhancement Routines.
Alison Taylor	Maria Sayre	Certification and expertise; Experienced teacher who is working as a long-term substitute and is new to the use of the SIM and our schools specific procedures	Meetings and in-service activities The mentor and mentee are meeting periodically in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies, specifically the Strategic Instructional Model Learning Strategies and Content Enhancement Routines.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Resource Specialist Assistant: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through activities such as co-teaching.

Speech Language Pathologist (contracted-attends as needed): Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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?

The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one objective: Student Achievement. We will develop and maintain a problem-solving atmosphere that best serves our students, our teachers, and our school.

The team will meet periodically to engage in the following activities:

- review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions;
- review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks.

Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will review the results of the FCAT assessment data from the 2011-12 school year and review and edit the objectives and action steps 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.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring System (PM2), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), STAR reading and math assessment
Progress Monitoring: PM2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation, STAR reading and math assessment
End of year: FCAT, STAR reading and math assessment
Frequency of Data Days: Benchmark assessment according to the SDIRC calendar

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' meetings which will occur throughout the year. Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions will be covered. District staff will train teachers on PM2 and the utilization of the data available via that vehicle.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Staff development for all teachers regarding the MTSS process; release time for teachers to attend MTSS meetings; professional development for teachers regarding multi-tiered interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Martha McAdams - Principal
Heidi Sutherland - Reading
Nan Thornton - Social Studies/Math
Alison Taylor - Science
Susanna Durand - Language Arts
Lynda McIntosh - Language Arts
Joy Kurtz - Resource Specialist

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

Team will meet quarterly to review individual and group trends in meeting SCJH and SDIRC Benchmarks in content areas. Teachers may meet in small groups to analyze assessment data and/or testing results from end of chapter tests.

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

The LLT team will have one focus: Student Achievement.
All initiatives will support the goal of enabling all students to be successful.

Review and discussion of instructional strategies for individuals, subgroups such as Hispanic students and students with AIPs/IEPs/504 Plans.

Reading & Writing Across the Curriculum will be stressed and ideas for infusion will be addressed in all subject areas.

*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.

Reading Across the Curriculum will be stressed and ideas for infusion will be addressed in all subject areas by the Leadership Team. All teachers will be provided training in various aspects of the Strategic Instructional Model to reinforce the use of reading strategies throughout the curriculum. During faculty meetings and inservice training teachers will be provided specific ideas and training on how to reinforce reading strategies in every class. Text Complexity and Common Core Standards will be topics of professional development.

*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?

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?

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The number of students achieving proficiency at SCJH will be increased by 2%. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Reading Assessment, 62% (105 of 170) of students demonstrated proficiency in Reading. This will be increased to 64% as assessed by the 2013 FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (105/170) of students demonstrated proficiency (Level 3 and above) on the 2012 FCAT Reading test	64% of students will score Level 3 and above based on the 2013 FCAT Reading test

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	Allowing students to utilize the computer lab and access FCAT Explorer for practice in higher-order questions is a barrier based on limited computers for mobile lab and difficulty connecting to the server with the mobile computers.	Provide additional supplemental materials. Provide additional time for students needing additional instruction in applying information	Principal Reading Teachers	Monitoring of student progress using SDIRC Benchmark Assessments	2013 FCAT Reading Assessment SDIRC Benchmark Assessments
2	Instructional Calendar Implement a timeline to assure all Sunshine State Standard Benchmarks are addressed prior to 2013 FCAT assessments.	Utilize the timelines from Course Organizers (SIM) timelines for instructional focus addressing Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	Principal Reading Teachers	Principal will monitor the implementation of the Course Organizers and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	Classroom observations; Teacher conferences; and lesson plan review
3	Scheduling/Monitoring	Implement check-out system for use of mobile computer lab	Principal Technology Team	Assistant Director will monitor the use of the check-out system	Feedback from teachers at faculty meetings

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The number of students achieving above proficiency at SCJH will be increased by 4%. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Reading Assessment, 29% (49 of 170) of students demonstrated above proficiency in Reading. This will be increased to 33% as assessed by the 2013 FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment 29% (49/170) students scored Levels 4 and 5.	Based on 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment 33% of students will score Levels 4 and 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Additional opportunities for students to participate in advanced and extended reading activities.	Increase number and topics of AR Books Increase availability of laptop computers to allow students to quickly access information, pique curiosity, and encourage higher level application of knowledge.	Principal; Reading teachers; Computer lab instructor; All subject area teachers	Monitoring of student applications using technology; Observations of extended activities; Student presentations; Increase in AR tests	SDIRC Benchmark Tests; Teacher assessments; Portfolio assessments; 2013 FCAT Reading
2	Funding/transportation	Involve more students in after school reading challenges and competitions. Attempt to create carpools for students who are interested in participating and do not have transportation	Principal; Reading teachers; Language Arts teachers	Monitoring the number of students participating in "Book Battle" and other extended day activities; Student presentations; Teacher observation	Number of students participating
3	Funding	Expand journalism course with emphasis on higher-level activities to be utilized with 7th and 8th grade students for 1 semester	Principal; Reading teachers; Language Arts teachers	Student presentations and portfolios; Teacher observation	Portfolio assessment; 2013 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	SCJH will increase the number of students making learning gains in Reading by 2%. Based on the FCAT 2012 Reading Assessment, 71% of students (121/170) made Learning Gains in reading. This will be increased to 73 % as assessed by the 2012 FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the FCAT 2012 Reading Assessment, 73% (124/170) of students made Learning Gains in reading.	Based on the FCAT 2013 Reading Assessment, 75% of students will demonstrate Learning Gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Uninterrupted reading blocks	Principal will schedule reading block/language arts block whenever possible for reinforcement of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. SCJH reading teachers will be teaching the SIM word mapping strategy to address Words/Phrases and inferred meanings	Principal Reading/language arts teachers	Student success in applying SIM strategies; Teacher observation and monitoring; Principal monitoring	Teacher tests and assessment SDIRC Benchmark Assessment Chapter Assessments/Tests 2013 FCAT 2.0

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	SCJH will increase the achievement of the students scoring in the Lowest 25% by 2% to improve learning gains. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Reading Assessment, 73% (31/43) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading. This will be increased to 75% as assessed by the 2013 FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 73% (31/43) of Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment, 75% of Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Flexible scheduling to allow lower performing students additional opportunities in reading.	Provide Intensive Reading classes to students requiring additional support in achieving High Standards in reading	Principal; Reading Teachers	Ongoing assessments Review PM2 achievement reports and address needs	PM2 Assessment SDIRC Benchmark Assessment 2012 FCAT Assessment
2	Funding	Provide additional instruction to students significantly below grade level utilizing the expertise of experienced teachers to provide intense instruction in small groups 3-5 days a week	Principal; Reading Teachers	Ongoing assessments Review PM2 achievement reports and address needs Teacher assessments	2013 FCAT assessment End of the Year teacher 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 # N/A					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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.	SCJH students will decrease the number of White Students not making satisfactory progress in reading from 21% to 20%.
--	---

Reading Goal #5B:	SCJH students will decrease the number of Hispanic Students not making satisfactory progress in reading from 11% to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 21% (35/170) of White Students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	White: Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment only 20% of White Students will not make satisfactory progress in reading.
Hispanic: Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 11% (18/170) of Hispanic Students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Hispanic: Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment only 10% of Hispanic Students will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Additional opportunities for White and Hispanic students to work in small groups or one on one with reading coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist reading teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for White and Hispanic Students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Principal Resource Specialist Reading Teachers LA Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Fair Testing Benchmark Testing 2013 Reading 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A Due to only having 3 ELL Students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A Due to only having 3 ELL Students.	N/A Due to only having 3 ELL Students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	SCJH students will decrease the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading from 10% to 9%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 10% (17/170)	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment only 9% of

of Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Students with Disabilities will not make satisfactory progress in reading.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Additional opportunities for (SWD) to work in small groups or one on one with reading coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist reading teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for (SWD).	Principal Resource Specialist Reading Teachers LA Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Fair Testing Benchmark Testing 2013 Reading 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	SCJH students will decrease the number of Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in reading from 22% to 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Economically Disadvantaged: Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 22% (38/170) of Economically Disadvantaged Students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Economically Disadvantaged: Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment only 21% of Economically Disadvantaged will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Additional opportunities for economically Disadvantaged Students to work in small groups or one on one with reading coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist reading teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for Economically Disadvantaged Students.	Principal Resource Specialist Reading Teachers LA Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Fair Testing Benchmark Testing 2013 Reading FCAT

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
Strategies to increase the number of students meeting high standards in reading	6-8	Principal Vice Principal Content Enhancement (CE) trainer FDLRS staff	school-wide subject area across grades LLT team	August and on going Monthly Language Arts planning with content area teachers	Inservice days devoted to strategies for school-wide improvement Monthly group meetings to assess progress	Principal Vice Principal CE trainer

Text complexity and how to use it in the classroom along with integration of the Common Core State Standards	6-8	Principal Vice Principal	School-wide	September and on-going	Inservice days and monthly group meetings to assess progress	Principal Vice Principal
--	-----	--------------------------	-------------	------------------------	--	--------------------------

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:	Only two (2) students took the CELLA test in 2011/12
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
N/A only 2 students took CELLA last year	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2					

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:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient 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
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:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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:	There will be a 2% increase in the number of the students achieving proficiency as assessed by the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Mathematics Assessment, 58% (99/170) of students demonstrated proficiency (Level 3 and above) in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (99/170) of SCJH students achieved proficiency (Level 3 and above) on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 6-8, 60% of the students will achieve proficiency (Level 3 and above) on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT.

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	Review of basic concepts	Reivew data reports and identify student needs.	Principal Math Teachers	Benchmark Assessment	PM2
2	Budget for manipulatives	Increase use of manipulatives and hands on activities in geometry and measurement	Principal Math Teachers	Principal will monitor during classroom observations	SDIRC Benchmark assessment 2013 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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.	There will be a 3% increase in 6-8 of the students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
--	--

Mathematics Goal #2a:	Based upon the FCAT 2012 Mathematics Assessment, 19% (32/170) of students demonstrated proficiency (Level 3 and above) in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 6-8, 19% (32 of 170) of the students achieved above proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	In grades 6-8, 22% of the students will achieve above proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling research opportunities	Develop mathematical opportunities that require research bound goals based on Next Generation SSS Mathematics Standards	Principal; Math Teachers	Principal will monitor during classroom observations	Rubric of Research Projects 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0
2	Scheduling additional time for on-line mathematical activities	Utilize on-line enrichment and challenging mathematical technology sites	Principal; Math Teachers	Principal will monitor lesson plans and feedback from teachers	Benchmark Assessments; 2013 Mathematics 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	SCJH will increase the percentage of the students making Learning Gains in Mathematics by 2 percent. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Mathematics Assessment, 65% (110/170) of students made Learning Gains in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% of (110/170) students demonstrated Learning Gains in Mathematics as assessed by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment	67% of students will demonstrate Learning Gains in Mathematics as assessed by the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Funding	Provide additional opportunities for disadvantaged students to have technology opportunities to practice and apply concepts	Principal Mathematics Teachers	On-going Assessments	SDIRC Benchmark Assessments and 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0
2	Transportation	Tutoring opportunities offered after school	Principal Mathematics Teachers	On-going Assessments	SDIRC Benchmarks and 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	SCJH will increase the achievement of the students scoring in the Lowest 25% by 2% to improve learning gains. Based upon the FCAT 2012 Mathematics Assessment, 65% (28/43) of students made Learning Gains in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment, 65% (28/43) of students in Lowest 25% made Learning Gains in Mathematics.	Based on the 2013 FCAT Mathematic Assessment, 67% of students in Lowest 25% will make Learning Gains in Mathematics.

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	Funding	Provide additional learning opportunities	Principal Teacher	Benchmark Assessment	Benchmark
	Transportation	Assist students in getting	Director	Roster of students	Rosters

2		into carpools so they can stay for after school math tutoring		staying for after school math tutoring	
---	--	---	--	--	--

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%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal #				
		N/A				
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	SCJH students will decrease the number of White Students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 24% to 23%. SCJH students will decrease the number of Hispanic Students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 11% to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment, 24% (41/170) of White Students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. Hispanic: Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment, 11% (19/170) of Hispanic Students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	White: Based on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment only 23% of White Students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. Hispanic: Based on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment only 10% of Hispanic Students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

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	Funding	Provide additional opportunities for students to have "hands-on" activities to reinforce concepts and demonstrate mastery of SSS.	Principal Mathematics Teachers	Benchmark testing FCAT Explorer practice in computer lab and mobile computer lab	Explorer reports SDIRC Benchmark Assessments
2	Transportation	Tutoring opportunities offered after school	Principal Mathematics Teachers	On-going Assessments	SDIRC Benchmark Assessments 2013 Mathematics FCAT
3	Additional opportunities for White and Hispanic Students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics to work in small groups or one on one with mathematics coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist mathematics teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for White and Hispanic Students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Principal Mathematics Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Benchmark Testing 2013 Mathematics 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A Due to only having 3 ELL students.
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					

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:	SCJH students will decrease the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 10% to 9%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment, 10% (17/170) of Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Based on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment only 9% of Students with Disabilities will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

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	Additional opportunities for (SWD) to work in small groups or one on one with mathematics coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist mathematics teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for (SWD).	Principal Mathematics Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Benchmark Testing 2013 Mathematics FCAT
2	Transportation	Tutoring opportunities offered after school	Principal Mathematics Teachers	On-going Assessments	Benchmark Testing 2013 Mathematics 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	SCJH students will decrease the number of Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 26% to 25%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Economically Disadvantaged: Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment, 26% (44/170) of Economically Disadvantaged Students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.			Economically Disadvantaged: Based on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment only 25% of Economically Disadvantaged Students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.		
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	Funding for extended day activities	Provide additional opportunities for disadvantaged students to have technology opportunities to practice and apply concepts	Principal Mathematics teachers	FCAT Explorer results SDIRC Benchmark testing	Time/attendance charts for after school programs
2	Additional opportunities for Economically Disadvantaged Students to work in small groups or one on one with mathematics coaches or teacher assistants.	SCJH will hire substitutes that are certified teachers to provide pull out of small student groups, assist mathematics teachers during whole class instruction, or to do one on one remediation for Economically Disadvantaged Students.	Principal Mathematics Teachers	Teacher observation and monitoring. Student improvement on assignments and testing.	Benchmark Testing 2013 Mathematics FCAT

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:			Due to the new mandate that all students who scored a 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math must take the Algebra EOC, the goal for 2013 is less than 100%. It is anticipated that 80% of students will score Level 3 or above on the Algebra EOC.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
100% (20 / 20) student who took the EOC scored at Level 3 or above in Algebra.			80% of student who take the 2013 Algebra EOC will score at Level 3 or above.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigorous material for students who only scored on grade level last year	Offer after school tutoring for students	Math department	Benchmark assessments	Benchmark assessments 2013 Algebra EOC
2	Transportation	Attempt to arrange car pools for students who ride the bus so they can stay after school for assistance	Director	Rosters of students staying for math tutoring	Rosters

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:	Due to the new mandate that all students who scored a 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math must take the Algebra EOC, the goal for 2013 is less than 45%. It is anticipated that 30% of students will score Level 4 or above on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (9/20) students scored Level 4 or above on the 2012 Algebra EOC.	30% of students will score Level 4 or above on the 2013 Algebra EOC.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigorous support and material for students who only scored at grade level	Offer after school tutoring to provide practice and instruction to students who need additional support.	Mathematics Department	Benchmark Assessment	Benchmark Assessment and 2013 Mathematics EOC
2	Transportation	Attempt to organize carpooling for students who ride the bus in order for them to participate in afterschool tutoring opportunities.	Director	Rosters	Rosters

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Algebra Goal # N/A 3A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
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				

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Geometry Goal #

3A :

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

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3B:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
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				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Strategies on how to reach subgroups needing additional assistance in the application of mathematical concepts	6-8	Principal Vice Principal CE Professional Developer FDLRS staff LLT team	Math and science teacher and substitute working with subgroups	August-on-going Monthly meeting between math and science teachers	Inservice days that include professional development in improving the teaching of mathematical concepts to subgroups Monitoring PM2 and discussing results as a math team	Principal Vice Principal Math teachers
Strategies on how to increase the number of students meeting high standards in mathematics	6-8	Principal Vice Principal Content Enhancement PDer FDLRS staff LLT team	Math and science teachers	August-on-going Monthly meeting between math and science teachers	Inservice days that include professional development in improving the teaching of mathematical concepts Monitoring PM2 and discussing results as a math team	Principal Vice Principal Math teachers

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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:	The percentage students achieving proficiency (Level 3 and above) as measured by the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment will increase by 2%. In grade 8, 40% (21/52) of the students achieved proficiency (Levels 3 and above) on the 2012 Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (21 of 52) of the 8th grade students achieved proficiency on the 2012 Science FCAT	42% of the 8th grade students will achieve proficiency on the 2013 Science FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of hands on experiments.	All 8th grade students will do an individual science project.	Principal. Science teachers.	Number of students who complete the science project	Science project grading matrix
2	Lack of real world experience or understanding	Guest speakers in the field of science and one designated field trip that is science related.	Principal Science teachers	Student evaluation of each coordinated event.	Student questionnaire

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:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

The percentage students achieving above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) as measured by the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment will increase by 2%.

Science Goal #2a:

In grade 8, 10% (5/52) of the students achieved above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 Science FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

10% (5/52) students achieved above proficiency on the 2012 Science FCAT.

12% students will achieve above proficiency on the 2013 Science FCAT.

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 scores on Science Benchmarks associated with Earth/Space Science	Emphasize the Benchmarks associated with Earth/Space Science	Principal Science Teachers	ON-going observation and monitoring of lesson plans	Teacher assessments
2	Low scores on Science Benchmarks associated	Emphasize the Benchmarks associated	Principal Science	On-going observation and monitoring of	Teacher Assessments

	with Physical Science	with Physical Science	Teachers	lesson plans	
3	Low scores on Science Benchmarks associated with Life Science	Emphasize the Benchmarks associated with Life Science	Principal Science Teachers	On-going observation and monitoring of lesson plans	Teacher 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.
Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
SIM Content Enhancement Training	6-8	Assistant principal Lead Teacher FDLRS Staff	School-wide	October	January	Principal Assistant principal Science teachers

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:	We will increase 2% in the number of students achieving proficiency in writing as assessed on the FCAT Writes! Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Writes! 86% of students at SCJH scored satisfactory or higher.	Based on the 2013 FCAT Writes! 88% of students will meet High Standards in writing.

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	Scheduling Understanding the FCAT rubric scoring	Students will address "formal" writing as opposed to instant message format.	Writing/Language Arts Teachers Consultants	Students will write to FCAT prompts and receive feedback regarding "rubric" assessment	Student responses based on 6 point rubric
2	Understanding the FCAT rubric scoring	Students will write to a variety of prompts provided on DOE websites	Writing/Language Arts Teachers Consultants	Students will write to FCAT prompts and receive feedback regarding "rubric" assessment	Student responses based on 6 point rubric 2012 FCAT Writes!
3	Funding	Purchase Data Driven Write Score, an assessment to be given 6 times each year	Writing/Language Arts Teachers; Consultants	Students will write to FCAT prompts and receive data driven feedback regarding "rubric" assessment	Student responses based on 6 point rubric 2013 FCAT Writes!

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Increase opportunities for students to critique writing samples for self improvement	6-8	Language Arts Teacher Lead Teacher	Language Arts	On-going staff development in small group/subject area meetings	Use prior writing samples to critique Review of students' writing portfolios	Principal Assistant principal Language Arts Teachers Consultant
Increase students' writing skills	6-8	Language Arts Teachers Lead Teacher	School-wide All content area teachers	On-going staff development on school site and district workshops	Review writing portfolios Review student progress Individual student conferencing	Principal Assistant principal Language arts teachers Consultant
Writing Across the Curriculum	6-8	Principal Assistant principal	School-wide All content area teachers B	By the end of September, review of research Continued at faculty meetings throughout the year	Review of lesson plans and classroom assignments Observations	Principal Assistant principal

Writing Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

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:	50% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in Civics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA Students have not previously taken the EOC for Civics	50% of students will score at Achievement Level 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have not had exposure to the vocabulary necessary to read the documents they will be studying nor have they studied the history that led up to the creation of the documents	Reading, language arts and social studies teachers will include the vocabulary that students need to know in their coursework	Social studies teachers, Assistant principal Principal	On-going monitoring of lesson plans	Civics End of Course 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 Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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:	Decrease number of tardies and absences at SCJH during the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
There was an average of 4% students absent (152/159 average daily attendance)	There will be an average of 3.5% students absent during the 2012-13 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

There were 31 students absent 10 or more days		Because of increased enrollment, we cannot project excessive absences. Therefore, the goal will be to maintain the number of students absent 10 or more days at 31 students.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
There were 6 students with excessive tardies..		Because of increased enrollment, we cannot project excessive tardies. However, the goal will be 6 students with excessive tardies.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Transportation of students Parents taking students out of school	Better communication	Principal School Director	Monitor attendance records	TERMS

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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:	There were 63 in-school suspensions during the 2010-11 school year and 18 out-of-school suspensions.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
The total number of in-school suspensions for 2010-11 was 63	Since the student population is increasing for the 2011-12 school year, it is anticipated that the in-school suspensions will remain the same as it was for the 2010-11 school year or 63 in-school suspensions.				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
40	40				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
18	18				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
18	18				
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	No barriers anticipated	Conferences with students and parents to avoid suspension	Principal	Number of students who are suspended	TERMS

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						

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)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		SCJH has a volunteer requirement of 8 hours per family. 62% (101/162) of families met or exceeded the 8 hour requirement for the 2010-2011 school year.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
SCJH has a volunteer requirement of 8 hours per family/per school year. 62% (101/162) of families met or exceeded the 8 hour requirement for the 2012-13 school year.		Based on PTSO volunteer records 65% (110/170) of families will meet or exceed the 8 hour requirement for the 2012-13 school year.			
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 economy has forced many parents to return to the workforce	Provide additional opportunities for parents to volunteer outside of the school day.	Principal PTSO Teacher Representative	Assistance to students and teachers	Sign-in sheets
2	Communication regarding when and how parents can contribute volunteer hours	Provide weekly e-Blast to parents who sign up for the service	Principal President PTSO	% of parents who meet their volunteer hours	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
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available 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:	The school will utilize its computer classes and will start a new class within the exploratory wheel, computer aided drafting, as well as provide Robotics/Lego Invention Club after school to introduce more STEM related content at school. The continuation and addition of these programs will assist in raising mathematics and Science FCAT scores 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	A reliable class set of computers	The school will order refurbished computers that should be more reliable.	Principal Assistant Director Computer Teachers CAD Teacher	Reports from teachers regarding classroom interruptions due to computer issues.	Computer maintenance log that is kept by the Assitant Director
2	Students having a clear understanding of STEM related content	The school will continue to provide computer classes and will create an exploratory wheel that includes a Computer Aided Drafting class. There will also be after school activities as well as classroom activities that concentrate on STEM.	Principal Computer Teachers Math Teachers Science Teachers	Student acheivement in computer, CAD, mathematics, and science classes	2013 Mathematics FCAT 2013 Science FCAT

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:		Increase the number of students involved with Career and Technical Education. Last year 52% 88/170 students took computer keyboarding or intro to simple computer applications.			
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	Scheduling and computer access	Provide additional time (including after school) and mobile labs to make more opportunities available	Principal Assistant principal Computer/classroom teachers	Number of students who are involved in Career and Technical classes	Schedule review and/or monitoring of students participating in Career and Technical classes

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

To increase the use of technology by teachers and students across all aspects of the curriculum. Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of To increase the use of technology by teachers and students across all aspects of the curriculum. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 9/13/2012)

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.

No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

SCJH is a charter school and according to state statue the Charter school's Board of Directors acts as the SAC committee

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount

See SCJH annual budget

\$0.00

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

Meet as the Board of Directors for the Charter school

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Indian River School District SEBASTIAN CHARTER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	73%	66%	79%	64%	282	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	71%	76%			147	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	79% (YES)	64% (YES)			143	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					572	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Indian River School District SEBASTIAN CHARTER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	66%	86%	62%	286	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	66%			132	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	68% (YES)	67% (YES)			135	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested