

# 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: MEHRDAD PEPPER GHAZVINI LEARNING CENTER

District Name: Leon

Principal: Richard Richardson

SAC Chair: Charles Bagwell

Superintendent: Jackie Pons

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/1/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	Richard Richardson	M.S. Educational Leadership B.S. Math Education Certification: Principal-All Levels	4	17	2011-2012 Principal- Second Chance *Ungraded School*  2010-2011 Principal- 100 Success Academy *Ungraded School*
Assis Principal	Wilfred Brown	M.S. Educational Leadership B.S. Physical Education Certification: Educational Leadership(All Levels)	1	1	2011-2012 Assistant Principal- The Success Academy
Assis Principal	Michael McDaniel	M.S. Educational Leadership B.S. Education Certifications: Educational Leadership(All Levels) Social Studies			N/A

		(6-12)			
Assis Principal	Jameeka Wallace	M.S. Educational Leadership B.S. Chemical Engineering Certifications: Educational Leadership(All Levels) Chemistry (6-12)  Mathematics (5-9)			N/A

### 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.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Jennifer Godwin				Ghavini Learning Center(GLC) Grade: N/A *GLC was not eligible to be graded under the A+ Plan.

### 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	1) Teacher Mentoring Program	Michael McDaniel and Carolyn Coggins	Annually for all beginning teachers	
2	2) Provide Leadership Opportunities	Richard Richardson	Annually	
3	3) Professional Development	Richard Richardson and Michael McDaniel	Annually	
4	4) Regular Meetings with New Teachers and Administrative Team	Richard Richardson, Wilfred Brown, Michael McDaniel and Jameeka Wallace	Weekly	

### 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
N/A	

### 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
6	16.7%(1)	50.0%(3)	16.7%(1)	16.7%(1)	33.3%(2)	100.0%(6)	33.3%(2)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)

### 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
Carolyn Coggins	Lyssa Oberkreser	Similar Background	New Teacher Program

## 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 A  
Second Chance will be governed by the statutory definition of parental involvement, and will carry out programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with the definition outlined in Section 9101(32) ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act).

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

#### Title I, Part D

Funds will be utilized to enhance classroom technology and instruction.

#### Title II

#### Title III

#### Title X- Homeless

#### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

#### Violence Prevention Programs

Peer Counseling Courses, Positive Behavior Support (PBS)Program, Character Education Program(Urban League), Guest Speakers(local communities), Leon County Schools Anti-Gang and Anti-Bullying Initiatives

#### Nutrition Programs

Back to Basics Health and Life Skills Education Program

#### 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.

Principal (Richard Richardson) and Assistant Principals (Wilfred Brown, Michael McDaniel and Jameeka Wallace): Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, conduct assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

Selected General Education Teachers (Roderick Glenn, Leah Dienger and other teaching staff, as appropriate): 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.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers (Amanda Womble, and additional ESE teaching staff, as appropriate): Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Instructional Coach/Academic and Behavioral Specialists (Michael McDaniel- Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Jennifer Godwin, Reading Coach, Maxin Reiss- Behavior Analyst, Larry Jennings – Student Case Specialist): Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist (Michael McDaniel- Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Jennifer Godwin, Reading Coach): Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist (Lauren Wukovits): Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities, including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist (Robin Cave): 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 measure; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel (Ruth Boykin – Social Worker, Susan Griggs – Guidance Counselor, Margot Palazesi – Program Specialist): Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, these participants link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Additional Core Members: Parent(s) and student(s)

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?

At a minimum, The Second Chance MTSS/RtI team meets the second and fourth Monday of each month. The MTSS/RtI Team follows a structured problem-solving process that makes the most efficient use of time to achieve the goal of developing effective student intervention plans. The MTSS/RtI Team problem-solving process is implemented when a Second Chance teacher(s) completes the Second Chance MTSS/RtI Form. When the MTSS/RtI Team receives this completed form, it schedules an initial meeting with the referring teacher. Prior to the initial meeting, the case manager meets with the referring teacher to review the referral form, answer any questions that the grade level team may have about the MTSS/RtI Team process, and decide what background and baseline information should be collected before the meeting.

The Second Chance MTSS/RtI Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers, and in our students? At the start of the initial MTSS/RtI Team meeting, the facilitator explains to the referring grade level team the purpose and structure of the problem-solving meeting. The MTSS/RtI Team meeting then conducts a general review of the referring teacher(s) concerns. The team and teacher(s) quickly narrow down those concerns to a manageable number, set goals for student improvement, create intervention plans matched to concerns, and identify methods for monitoring the student's response to the intervention strategies. The goal of the initial meeting is to develop a detailed intervention plan that the instructional team can implement. A follow-up meeting is scheduled (typically within six to eight weeks of the initial meeting), at which time the team will reconvene with the teacher(s) to determine whether the intervention plan was successful or needs to be modified or replaced.

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?

Members of the Second Chance MTSS/RtI team meet with the Second Chance School Advisory Council (SAC) to help develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The Second Chance School Improvement Plan is a guiding force within the MTSS/RtI as interventions are sought to meet individual student needs.

#### 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.

Second Chance uses the internet based Discipline Database (Educator's Handbook) as the primary source of behavioral data. This database tracks student referrals at the individual, classroom and school level. It includes antecedent and context information that will assist with functional assessments for planned intervention development. In addition to Educator's Handbook, the MTSS/RtI team manages graphs and charts to illustrate the effectiveness of tiered intervention strategies. Data management systems (both academic and behavioral) are utilized during each MTSS/RtI meeting.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Educator's Handbook, Data Director, Success Maker 5, Ascend Math, and Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Educator's Handbook, FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading), DataDirector, Success Maker 5 and PLATO Learning Systems.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Initial professional development will take place during the MTSS/RtI Open House for Second Chance staff and teachers, which is held during the first weeks of the new school year. The purpose and process of response to intervention is presented and discussed. Training and support is available throughout the school year as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the monthly MTSS/RtI team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Initial professional development will take place during the MTSS/RtI Open House for Second Chance staff and teachers, which is held during the first weeks of the new school year. The purpose and process of response to intervention is presented and discussed. Training and support is available throughout the school year as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the monthly MTSS/RtI team meetings.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Richard Richardson, Principal  
Wilfred Brown, Assistant Principal  
Michael McDaniel, Assistant Principal  
Jameeka Wallace, Assistant Principal  
Jennifer Godwin, Reading Coach, MS Reading/Language Arts, Math and ESE Teacher  
Carolyn Coggins, Media Specialist  
Lyssa Oberkreser, HS Reading/Language Arts and Social Studies Teacher  
Larry Jennings, Student Case Specialist

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

The Second Chance Literacy Leadership Team meets each nine-week grading period, or more if needed, and is a collaborative system that encourages a literate climate to support effective teaching and learning at Second Chance. The Second Chance Literacy Leadership Team supports the development, implementation, and monitoring of the Leon County Schools Reading Plan and the Second Chance Literacy Initiatives/Second Chance Literacy Goals. The Second Chance Literacy Leadership Team facilitates professional learning opportunities to improve literacy achievement in all instructional classrooms, gathers, analyzes, and interprets school data, establishes goals based on data, develops strategies to achieve the goals, establishes measures of success, supports teachers in implementing the literacy strategies, and ensures literacy remains a priority at Second Chance.

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

Second Chance Literacy Goals (Student Writing Journals, Writing Portfolios, Monthly student book reading, and Required student research papers/projects)

## 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.

Second Chance teachers and administrative staff will meet weekly through Professional Learning Community meetings (every Tuesday), Second Chance Faculty Meetings (every Thursday), and grade level/course meetings. Specific strategy instruction is on-going at SC and takes place in PLC, Faculty, and various grade/course team meetings. Reading strategy instruction is also part of every teacher's Deliberate Practice Plan/Individual Professional Development Plan(IPDP).

### \*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?

Teachers will meet weekly to discuss the integration of various course lessons/units. Literacy, writing, and problem solving strategies are incorporated into all curriculum areas.

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?

Students are individually placed in courses based on student data and student needs. The guidance department reviews course offerings and meets with 8th grade students to discuss High School course options. In addition, career planning is incorporated in 7th grade Civics, and 8th grade American History courses. CHOICES/e-PEP is utilized in 7th and 8th grade, and in select High School courses.

## 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](#)

Availability of accelerated curriculum to close grade level gap with co-hort group.

## 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:	Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%(2)	15%

#### 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	1.1. Instructional rigor is lacking.	1.1. Increase text complexity, text length and vocabulary level of student reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will intentionally develop higher-order questions (Advanced level) in both oral and written form</li> <li>Increased text length will be monitored</li> </ul>	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 (for Elementary and Middle School), QAR mid-term/end of term assessments and FCAT Reading scores.	1.1. FAIR reports, Sm5 reports, QAR assessments, CBM (Curriculum Based Measures), Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies. Student reading logs will be reviewed for text length.
2	1.2. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	1.2. Implementation of PLATO Learning Systems.  Daily Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Reading	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores	1.2. FAIR reports, Sm5 Reading reports, CBM (Curriculum Based Measures), Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of



					strategies. Student products Teacher IPDP follow-up evaluation.
3	1.3. An imbalance in instructional emphasis of content over the learning process/strategies	1.3. Implementation of PLATO Learning Systems Daily Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Reading	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.3. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data(for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores	1.3. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies. Student products Teacher Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up evaluation.

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	Increase the percent of students achieving above proficiency in reading by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% (0)

2%

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Instructional rigor is lacking.	2.1. Increase text complexity, text length and vocabulary level of student reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will intentionally develop higher-order questions in both oral and written form</li> <li>Increased text length will be monitored by teachers</li> </ul>	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), QAR assessments and FCAT Reading scores.	2.1. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports QAR assessments CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies. Student reading logs will be reviewed for text length.
2	2.2. Weakness in student ability to synthesize and problem solve. An imbalance in instructional emphasis of content over the learning process/strategies.	2.2. Daily Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Reading	2.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.2. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores	2.2. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies. Student products Teacher Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up evaluation.
3	2.3 Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	2.3 Implementation of the Second Chance Literacy Initiative which requires each student to produce at least one research projects/papers per semester ranging from a mini research paper to and in-depth research paper with bibliography.	2.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.3. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores	2.3. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.

					Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies. Student products
--	--	--	--	--	---

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the percent of students making learning gains by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (5)	40%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	3.1. Utilization of FAIR data to develop small group instruction in needed areas of reading (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension.)  Improved use of para-professionals.  Use of FAIR Tool Kit with particular emphasis on	3.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores.	3.1. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports CBM (Curriculum Based Measures)  Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.

		Lexiled passages, scaffolded discussion templates to teach Question/Answer/Response (QAR) strategies.			Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.
2	3.2. Not enough independent reading time	.2. Utilization of PLATO Learning System  Students will read a minimum of one book per month, matched to their Lexile level. Support and monitoring will be provided through teacher conferences.	3.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.2. Analysis of individual student PLATO reports.	3.2. PLATO student reports
3	3.3. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	3.3. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress and attendance policy.	3.3. Second Chance Administrative Team, and PBS team	3.3. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	3.3. Genesis attendance reports  Educator's Handbook reports

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	4.1. Utilization of FAIR data to develop small group instruction in needed areas of reading (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension.)  Improved use of para-professionals.  Use of FAIR Tool Kit with particular emphasis on Lexiled passages, scaffolded discussion templates to teach Question/Answer/Response (QAR) strategies.	4.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	4.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores.	4.1. FAIR reports  Sm5 Reading reports  CBM (Curriculum Based Measures)  Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.  Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.
2	4.2. Not enough independent reading time	4.2. Utilization of PLATO Learning System  Students will read a minimum of one book per month, matched to their Lexile level. Support and monitoring will be provided through teacher conferences.	4.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	4.2. Analysis of individual student PLATO reports.	4.2. PLATO student reports
3	4.3. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	4.3. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress and attendance policy.	4.3. Second Chance Administrative Team, and PBS team	4.3. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	4.3. Genesis attendance reports  Educator's Handbook reports

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 # Second Chance will reduce the achievement gap in reading by 50% in six years. In 2010-2011, 21% of students scored at level 3 or higher in reading.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	27.58	34.16	40.74	47.32	53.9	

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:	Increase the percent of student subgroups making satisfactory progress in Reading by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: N/A Black: 86 (12) Hispanic: NA	White: NA Black: 24% Hispanic: NA

Asian: NA  
American Indian: NA

Asian: NA  
American Indian: NA

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	5B.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	5B.1. Utilization of FAIR data to develop small group instruction in needed areas of reading (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension.)  Improved use of para-professionals.  Use of FAIR Tool Kit with particular emphasis on Lexiled passages, scaffolded discussion templates to teach Question/Answer/Response (QAR) strategies.	5B.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	5B.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, Pearson Reading data (for Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores.	5B.1. FAIR reports Sm5 Reading reports  CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Vocabulary tests  Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.  Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.
2	5B.2. Not enough independent reading time with students matched to books at individual Lexile range.	5B.2. Students will read a minimum of one book per month, matched to their Lexile level.  Support and monitoring will be provided through teacher conferences.	5B.2 Second Chance Administrative Team	5B.2. Analysis of individual student book log and conference sheets.	5B.2. Student Book Log
3	5B.3 Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	5B.3 PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress and attendance policy.	5B.3 Second Chance Administrative Team, and PBS team	5B.3 Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	5B.3 Genesis attendance report  Educator's Handbook report

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
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Reading by 2%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (14)	14%

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	5E.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	5E.1. Utilization of FAIR data to develop small group instruction in needed areas of reading (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension.)  Improved use of para-professionals.  Use of FAIR Tool Kit with particular emphasis on Lexiled passages, scaffolded discussion templates to teach Question/Answer/Response (QAR) strategies.	5E.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	5E.1. Improvement in FAIR progress monitoring data, sm5 data (for Elementary and Middle School), and FCAT Reading scores.	5E.1. FAIR reports Pearson Reading reports CBM (Curriculum Based Measures) Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs. Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.
	5E.2. Not enough independent reading time with	5E.2. Students will read a minimum of one book per	5E.2 Second Chance Administrative	5E.2. Analysis of individual student book log and	5E.2. Student Book Log

2	students matched to books at individual Lexile range.	month, matched to their Lexile level.  Support and monitoring will be provided through teacher conferences.	Team	conference sheets.	
3	5E.3 Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	5E.3 PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress and attendance policy.	5E.3 Second Chance Administrative Team, and PBS team	5E.3 Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	5E.3 Genesis attendance report  Educator's Handbook report

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
Common Core Implementation	All grades and subjects	Michael McDaniel	All Second Chance Instructors	August 2012 Pre-Planning	Lesson Plans and Walk-Through Observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (Topics determined by instructional need)	All grade levels and subject areas	Richard Richardson Wilfred Brown Michael McDaniel Jameeka Wallace	All Second Chance Instructors	Weekly	Lesson Plans and Walk-Through Observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
PLATO	All Second Chance Instructors	Carolyn Coggins, Julie Strickland, Dea Stephens and Lee Allen	All MS and HS Instructors and Second Chance Administrative Team	Pre-Planning Additional training as needed	Lesson Plans, PLATO reports, Walk-Through Observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Second Chance Administrative Team Carolyn Coggins
FAIR Tool Kit Training	Reading/LA MS and HS	Michael McDaniel	All Second Chance Reading/Language Arts Teachers	September 2012	Lesson Plans and Walk-Through Observations	Second Chance Administrative Team

Reading 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 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:				
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

## Elementary 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:				
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:

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. Mathematics Goal # 2a:				
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:

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:	
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:

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:

--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	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"/>	<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:

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

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  
 Mathematics Goal #5C:

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  
 Mathematics Goal #5D:

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	
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 Elementary School Mathematics 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:	Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency (FCAT level 3) in Math by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.1. Improved use of para-professionals.  Daily/weekly Differentiated	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (Elementary and Middle School), sm5	1.1. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT

		Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math		data (Elementary and Middle School)and FCAT Math scores.	
2	1.2. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	1.2. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (Elementary and Middle School), sm5 data (Elementary and Middle School)and FCAT Math scores.	1.2. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT
3	1.3.Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	1.3. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress code and attendance policy.	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.3. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	1.3. Attendance reports via Genesis  Educator's Handbook reports

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 2a:	Increase the percent of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in Math by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

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	2.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	2.1. Improved use of para-professionals.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 and FCAT Math scores.	2.1. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT
2	2.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	2.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	2.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.2. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 and FCAT Math scores.	2.2. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT
3	2.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	2.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	2.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	2.3 PBS Celebration 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	Increase the percent of students making learning gains in Math by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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	3.1. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	3.1. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	3.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 (Elementary and Middle School)and FCAT Math scores.	3.1. Data Director, sm5 and FCAT
2	3.2. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	3.2. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.	3.2. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	3.2. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	3.2. Attendance reports via Genesis  Educator's Handbook reports
3	3.3. Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	3.3. Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	3.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities.	3.3. PBS Celebration 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:

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:	Increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math by 5%
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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	4.1. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	4.1. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	4.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	4.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 (Elementary and Middle School) and FCAT Math scores.	4.1. Data Director, sm5 and FCAT
2	4.2. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	4.2. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress code and attendance policy.	4.2. Second Chance Administrative Team an PBS Team	4.2. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	4.2. Attendance report via Genesis  Educator's Handbook report
3	4.3. Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	4.3. Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	4.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	4.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities.	4.3. PBS Celebration Rosters

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 # Second Chance will reduce the achievement gap in mathematics by 50% in six years. In 2010-2011, 21% of students scored at level 3 or higher in reading.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	27.58	34.16	40.74	47.32	53.9	

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:	Increase the percent of student subgroups making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: N/A Black: 100 (15) Hispanic: NA	White: N/A Black: 5% Hispanic: NA

Asian: NA American Indian: NA			Asian: NA American Indian: NA		
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	5.B.1. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	5.B.1. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	5.B.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	5.B.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 (Elementary and Middle School) and FCAT Math scores.	5.B.1. Data Director, sm5 and FCAT
2	5.B.2. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	5.B.2. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress code and attendance policy.	5.B.2. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	5.B.2. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	5.B.2. Attendance report via Genesis  Educator's Handbook report
3	5.B.3. Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	5.B.3. Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	5.B.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	5.B.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities.	5.B.3. PBS Celebration 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 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
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	N/A
---	-----

Mathematics Goal #5D:				
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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Increase the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Mathematics by 2%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (16)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.E.1. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	5.E.1. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	5.E.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	5.E.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring (for Elementary and Middle School), sm5 (Elementary and Middle School) and FCAT Math scores.	5.E.1. Data Director, sm5 and FCAT
2	5.E.2. Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	5.E.2. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress code and attendance policy.	5.E.2. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	5.E.2. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	5.E.2. Attendance report via Genesis  Educator's Handbook report
3	5.E.3. Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	5.E.3. Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	5.E.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	5.E.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities.	5.E.3. PBS Celebration Rosters

## 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.		N/A		
Mathematics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
100%(1)		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 group:

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.		N/A		
Mathematics Goal #2:				
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 group:

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics.		N/A		
Mathematics Goal #3:				

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				

## 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:	Increase the number of students scoring at the achievement level by 2%.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Algebra	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	1.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	1.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	1.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	1.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	1.3. Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	1.3. Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	1.3. PBS Celebration 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:	Increase the number of students scoring at or above achievement levels by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%(0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	2.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Algebra	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	2.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	2.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	2.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.2. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	2.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	2.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	2.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	2.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	2.3 PBS Celebration 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 #					
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: Second Chance will reduce the achievement gap annually by 8.3%, using best practices in delivering algebra					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	8.3%	16.7%	25%	33.3%	41.7%	

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:	Increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 0% (0) Black: 0% (0) Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 2% Black: 2% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA

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	3.B.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	3.B.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Algebra	3.B.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.B.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	3.B.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	3.B.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	3.B.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	3.B.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.B.2. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring, andDA assessments	3.B.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	3.B.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	3.B.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	3.B.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	3.B.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	3.B.3 PBS Celebration 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 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:	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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	Increase the number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1 by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.E.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	3.E.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Algebra	3.E.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.E.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	3.E.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	3.E.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	3.E.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	3.E.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.E.2. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	3.E.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	3.E.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	3.E.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	3.E.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	3.E.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	3.E.3 PBS Celebration Rosters

*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:	Increase the number of students scoring at achievement level 3 by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

0% (0)		2%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.1. Chunking content Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Geometry	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	1.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	1.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	1.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	1.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	1.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	1.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	1.3 PBS Celebration 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 Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	Increase the number of students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in Geometry by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	2.1. Chunking content Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Geometry	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring and DA assessments	2.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	2.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	2.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	2.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.2. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	2.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	2.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	2.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	2.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	2.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	2.3 PBS Celebration 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%.		Geometry Goal # Second Chance will reduce the achievement gap annually by 8.3%, using best practices in delivering Geometry instruction aligned to common core curriculum.			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	8.3%	16.7%	25%	33%	

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:	Increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in Geometry by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 0% (0) Black: 0% (0) Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 2% Black: 2% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA

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	3.B.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	3.B.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Geometry	3.B.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.B.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring, and DA assessments	3.B.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
2	3.B.2. Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	3B.2. A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	3.B.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.B.2. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring, and DA assessments	3.B.2. Data Director, and DA assessments
3	3.B.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	3.B.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	3.B.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	3.B.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	3.B.3 PBS Celebration 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 subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry 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 Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3D:	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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E:	Increase the number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Geometry by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.E.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	3.E.1. Chunking content  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in Geometry	3.E.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	3.E.1. Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring and DA assessments	3.E.1. Data Director, and DA assessments
	3.E.2.	3.E.2.	3.E.2.	3.E.2.	3.E.2.

2	Lack of individually designed inquiry based products/projects.	A minimum of one special student inquiry project per semester will be required in each math class.	Second Chance Administrative Team	Improvement in student performance on: Data Director progress monitoring and DA assessments	Data Director, and DA assessments
3	3.E.3 Lack of peer role models succeeding above grade level.	3.E.3 Continued implementation of PBS behavior recognition where students are recognized school-wide for positive behavior and academic choices.	3.E.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	3.E.3 Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities	3.E.3 PBS Celebration Rosters

*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
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All Grades and Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Sm5	Middle School Math Classes	Lee Allen and Larry Jennings	Elementary and Middle School Math Teachers	September 2012	Lesson Plans, Sm5 reports, walk-through observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Larry Jennings
Unwrapping the Math Benchmarks	All Math Grade Levels	Michael McDaniel	All Math Teachers	As required	Lesson Plans, walk-through observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Second Chance Administrative Team

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

## 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:			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	1.A.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.A.1. Horizontal and vertical math planning between grade levels.  Improved use of paraprofessionals.  Infusion of common core standards.  Daily/ weekly differentiated accountability (DA) lessons in science.	1.A.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.A.1. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	1.A.1. Data Director Assessments  FCAT Science scores
2	1.A.2. Lack of student science literacy	1.A.2. Daily emphasis on science vocabulary within the classroom  Daily/ weekly emphasis on making connections between science curriculum and real world experiences	1.A.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.A.2. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	1.A.2. Data Director Assessments  FCAT Science scores
3	1.A.3. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve	1.A.3. incorporation of daily/ weekly science application problems  Minimum of one student project per semester in order for students to apply their knowledge of science in real world situations	1.A.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.A.3. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	1.A.3. Data Director Assessments  FCAT Science scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	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 group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	Increase the percent of students achieving above proficiency in science to 2%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.A.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	2.A.1. Horizontal and vertical math planning between grade levels.  Improved use of paraprofessionals.  Infusion of common core standards.  Daily/ weekly differentiated accountability (DA) lessons in science.	2.A.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.A.1. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	2.A.1. Data Director progress monitoring assessments,  FCAT Science scores
2	2.A.2. Lack of student science literacy	2.A.2. Daily emphasis on science vocabulary within the classroom  Daily/ weekly emphasis on making connections between science curriculum and real world experiences	2.A.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.A.2. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	2.A.2. Data Director progress monitoring assessments,  FCAT Science scores
3	2.A.3. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve	2.A.3. incorporation of daily/ weekly science application problems  Minimum of one student project per semester in order for students to apply their knowledge of science	2.A.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.A.3. Increased Data Director progress monitoring and FCAT scores	2.A.3. Data Director progress monitoring assessments,  FCAT Science scores



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

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

## 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:	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 group:

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring	
---	--

at or above Level 7 in science.		N/A		
Science Goal #2:				
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				

## 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.		Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency in biology by 2%.			
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (0)		2%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.1. Horizontal and vertical math planning between grade levels.  Improved use of paraprofessionals.  Infusion of common core standards.  Daily/ weekly differentiated accountability (DA) lessons in science.	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	1.1. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC scores
2	1.2. Lack of student science literacy	1.2. Daily emphasis on science vocabulary within the classroom  Daily/ weekly emphasis on making connections between science	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	1.2. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC

		curriculum and real world experiences			scores
3	1.3. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve	1.3. Incorporation of daily/ weekly science application problems  Minimum of one student project per semester in order for students to apply their knowledge of science in real world situations	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.3. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	1.3. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC scores

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.  Biology Goal #2:	Increase the percent of students achieving above proficiency in biology by 2%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	2%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of differentiated instruction	2.1. Horizontal and vertical math planning between grade levels.  Improved use of paraprofessionals.  Infusion of common core standards.  Daily/ weekly differentiated accountability (DA) lessons in science.	2.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.1. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	2.1. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC scores
2	2.2. Lack of student science literacy	2.2. Daily emphasis on science vocabulary within the classroom  Daily/ weekly emphasis on making connections between science curriculum and real world experiences	2.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.2. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	2.2. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC scores
3	2.3. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve	2.3. incorporation of daily/ weekly science application problems  Minimum of one student project per semester in order for students to apply their knowledge of science in real world situations	2.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	2.3. Increased Data Director progress monitoring  Biology EOC score (passing)	2.3. Data Director progress monitoring assessments  Biology EOC scores

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
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All Grades All Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team

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:	Increase the percent of students scoring at the proficiency level by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (4)	40%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.A.1. Instructional rigor is lacking.	1.A.1. Increase student opportunities to write across all content areas.  Students will use the writing process daily: all writing will be dated and recorded in journal, notebook, or student portfolio for monitoring of growth across time.	1.A.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1A.1. Improvement in Writes Upon Request (WUR) scores and FCAT Writing.	1.A.1. Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.  Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.  WUR and FCAT Writing scores
2	1.A.2. Weakness in student ability to utilize the writing process and demonstrate mastery of 6+1 Writing Traits (Ideas and Development, Organization, Voice, Word Choice, Sentence Fluency, Conventions & Presentation, and ultimately publication) within their writing products.	1.A.2. Implementation of 6+1 Writing Traits Instruction and Assessment  Weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Writing	1.A.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.A.2. Improvement in student products (using 6+1 Writing Trait rubrics) in Writes Upon Request (WUR) scores and FCAT Writing.	1.A.2. Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.  Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.  Student products
3	1.A.3 Lack of individually designed inquiry based writing products/projects.	1.A.3 Implementation of the Second Chance Literacy Initiative which requires each student to produce at least one research projects/papers per semester ranging from a mini research paper to and in-depth research paper with bibliography.	1.A.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.A.3. Improvement in student products (using 6+1 Writing Trait rubrics) in Writes Upon Request (WUR) scores and FCAT Writing.	1.A.3. Observations noted on classroom walkthrough logs.  Evaluation of teacher lesson plans to determine implementation of strategies.  Student products

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:	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				

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
6+1 Writing Traits Training	All grades and subjects	Michael McDaniel	All Second Chance Teachers	Pre-Planning and as needed	Lesson Plans, walk-through observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Second Chance Administrative Team
Common Core Writing	All grades and subjects	Michael McDaniel	All Second Chance Teachers	Pre-Planning and as needed	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All grades and subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team

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

## 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:				
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 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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Civics Goals*

## U.S. History 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 U.S. History.  U.S. History 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 U.S. History.  U.S. History 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						

U.S. History 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 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:	Increase student daily attendance rate by 5%.  Decrease student absences by 10%,  Decrease student tardy rate by 10%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
77.6%	82.6%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
107	96
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
11	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	1.1. Peer and community pressure not to attend school.	1.1. PBS implementation	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.1. PBS data	1.1. PBS data
2	1.2. Lack of parent involvement.	1.2. Increase parent participation through Title I initiatives.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team  Title I Parent Action Team	1.2. Genesis attendance/tardy/late reports	1.2. Genesis reports
	1.3. Past and present academic failure	1.3. Provide differentiated instruction and needed tutoring and support, implement on-going	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.3. Improvement in student performance on: FAIR progress monitoring, DataDirector and FCAT	1.3. FAIR data, sm5, Pearson Reading, and DataDirector data reports, and

3		progress monitoring		Reading scores. Improvement in DataDirector progress monitoring data, sm5, and FCAT data.	FCAT 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
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All grades and subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Title I Parent Action Team Meetings	All grades and subjects	Varied	SA Administrators, Title I Parent Action Team Members, Leon County School staff	Monthly and/or Quarterly	Genesis reports, Parent Climate Survey	Second Chance Administrative Team

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:	Decrease suspension rate by 10%.  Decrease number of out-of-school suspension by 10%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
376	338
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
158	142

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	1.1. Past and present behavioral and judicial issues	1.1. On-going support and monitoring by court and probation officers	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Genesis Reports, Educator's Handbook Reports, PBS documentation	1.1. Genesis Reports Educator's Handbook Reports  PBS documentation
2	1.2. Poor academic ability and success	1.2. Provide differentiated instruction and needed tutoring and support; implement on-going progress monitoring.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in student performance on: FAIR, Data Director, sm5, End of Course Exams and FCAT data.	1.2. FAIR data Data Director reports sm5 reports FCAT data
3	1.3. Lack of impulse control by students	1.3. PBS implementation	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.3. Increase in the percentage of students attending PBS reward activities.	3.3. PBS Celebration Rosters

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
Title I Parent Action Team Meetings	All Grades All Subjects	Varied	Second Chance Administrators, Title I Parent Action Team Members, Leon County School staff	Monthly and/or Quarterly	Genesis reports, Parent Climate Survey	Second Chance Administrative Team
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All Grades All Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Dropout Prevention  Dropout Prevention Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	N/A

2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:	
N/A		N/A	
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:	
N/A		N/A	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	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						

Dropout Prevention Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		Increase Parent Involvement by 5%.  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
0%		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	1.1. Family socio-economic issues (lack of transportation, difficult work schedules, etc.)	1.1. Provide phone conferences, e-mail communication, and flexibility in scheduling parent conferences	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Second Chance on-line phone logs. Guidance calendar of parent conferences	1.1. Second Chance on-line phone logs  Guidance calendar of parent conferences
2	1.2. Poor history of parent involvement	1.2. Second Chance Open House, parents invited to attend guest speaker assemblies, Second Chance celebrations and other special school events	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Monitor Parent Sign-In Rosters	1.2. Parent Sign-In Rosters
3	1.3. Lack of parenting skills	1.3. Parent section in monthly Title I SA newsletter	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.3. Increase in parent communication	1.3. Second Chance on-line phone log, parent sign-in rosters

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.

				Target Dates	
--	--	--	--	--------------	--

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)	(e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SA Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All Grades All Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Title I Parent Action Team Meetings	All Grades All Subjects	Varied	Second Chance Administrators, Title I Parent Action Team Members, Leon County School staff	Monthly and/or Quarterly	Genesis reports, Parent Climate Survey	Second Chance Administrative Team

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		Increase the percent of students achieving proficiency (FCAT level 3) in Math by 2%.			
STEM Goal #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	1. Lack of differentiated instruction	1.1. Improved use of para-professionals.  Daily/weekly Differentiated	1.1 Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (Elementary and Middle School),	1.1. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT



		Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math		sm5 data (Elementary and Middle School)and FCAT Math scores.	
2	1.2. Weakness in students' ability to synthesize and problem solve.	1.2. Incorporation of daily math word problems/student projects in order for students to apply their knowledge in real world situations.  Daily/weekly Differentiated Accountability (DA) lessons in the area of Math	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.2. Improvement in student performance on: DataDirector progress monitoring (Elementary and Middle School), sm5 data (Elementary and Middle School)and FCAT Math scores.	1.2. DataDirector, sm5 and FCAT
3	1.3.Lack of school attendance due to behavioral and judicial issues	1.3. PBS (Positive Behavior Support) implementation.  Implementation of Second Chance dress code and attendance policy.	1.3. Second Chance Administrative Team and PBS Team	1.3. Analysis of PBS data, school attendance and Educator's Handbook data	1.3. Attendance reports via Genesis  Educator's Handbook 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
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (need based topics)	All Grades and Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Unwrapping the Math Benchmarks	All Math Grade Levels	Michael McDaniel	All Math Teachers	As required	Lesson Plans, walk-through observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Second Chance Administrative Team
Sm5	Middle School Math Classes	Lee Allen and Larry Jennings	Elementary and Middle School Math Teachers	September 2012	Lesson Plans, Sm5 reports, walk-through observations, and Deliberate Practice Plan/IPDP follow-up	Larry Jennings

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

*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:		Provide career awareness to all enrolled 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	1.1. Peer and community pressure not to attend school.	1.1. Implementation of CHOICES Planner Program  Implementation of PBS Program	1.1. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.1. Monitoring CHOICES reports  Monitoring PBS data	1.1. CHOICES reports  PBS data
2	1.2. Lack of parent involvement.	1.2. Increase parent participation through Title I initiatives.	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team  Title I Parent Action Team	1.2. Genesis attendance/tardy/latereports	1.2. Genesis attendance/tardy/latereports
3	1.3. Past and present academic failure	1.3. Provide differentiated instruction and needed tutoring and support, implement on-going progress monitoring	1.2. Second Chance Administrative Team	1.3. Improvement in student performance on: FAIR progress monitoring, Sm5, Data Director and FCAT data.	1.3. FAIR data, sm5, Pearson Reading, and DataDirector data reports, and FCAT 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
Second Chance Professional Learning Community (nedd based topics)	All grades All Subjects	Varied	All Second Chance Teachers	Weekly throughout the school year	Lesson Plans and walk-through observations	Second Chance Administrative Team
Title I Parent Action Team Meetings	All grades All Subjects	Varied	Second Chance Administrators, Title I Parent Action Team Members, Leon County School staff	Monthly and/or Quarterly	Genesis reports, Parent Climate Survey	Second Chance Administrative Team

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)

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$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 9/18/2012)

## 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
Promote Second Chance's Positive Behavior Support Program.	\$0.00

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

Monitor Second Chance School Improvement Plan (SIP) progress on meeting objectives.

## 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  
No Data Found  
No Data Found