

Walton County School District

# Seaside Neighborhood School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Seaside Neighborhood School

10 SMOLIAN CIRCLE, Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

<http://www.seasideschool.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Drew Ward**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 5-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	7%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (86%) 2017-18: A (86%) 2016-17: A (82%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (83%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 9/17/2019.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Seaside Neighborhood School

10 SMOLIAN CIRCLE, Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

<http://www.seasideschool.net/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 5-12	No	10%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	12%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 9/17/2019.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

We seek to sustain an educational community where an emphasis on academic excellence is complemented by our concern for each learner's personal growth and intellectual, aesthetic, and psychological development. The curriculum is developmentally responsive – actively engaging students in learning skills in context, integrative – directing students to connect learning to daily lives, and exploratory – enabling students to discover their abilities, interests, learning styles, and ways that they can make contributions to society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Seaside School is to maintain a small school with faculty knowledgeable about each student's abilities and challenges so that they can offer increased support to each student to meet those challenges and increase their skills to perform successfully in all academic areas.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Prey, Scott	Principal	Head of Schools for Seaside School, Inc Principal Seacoast Collegiate High School
Mixson, Kim	Principal	
Creter, Stacey	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor for Seacoast Collegiate HS grades 9-12
Ward, Drew	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor for Seacoast Collegiate HS grades 9-12
Carlson, Candace	School Counselor	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	46	46	47	46	48	48	48	48	377	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	1	8	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	11	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	8	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)****Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 6/13/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	6	0	1	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	0	0	1	10

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3



## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	90%	62%	56%	88%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	57%	51%	70%	56%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	46%	42%	71%	49%	41%
Math Achievement	98%	69%	51%	98%	71%	49%
Math Learning Gains	89%	58%	48%	84%	61%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%	57%	45%	86%	55%	39%
Science Achievement	89%	83%	68%	89%	81%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	99%	81%	73%	95%	72%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	46 (0)	46 (0)	47 (0)	46 (0)	48 (0)	48 (0)	48 (0)	48 (0)	377 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	1 ( )	2 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	1 ( )	4 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	1 ( )	0 ( )	2 ( )	0 ( )	4 ( )	0 ( )	1 ( )	8 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	1 ( )	9 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	1 ( )	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 ( )	2 ( )	3 ( )	1 ( )	1 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	8 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	96%	64%	32%	56%	40%
	2018	89%	60%	29%	55%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	89%	55%	34%	54%	35%
	2018	83%	62%	21%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	88%	64%	24%	52%	36%
	2018	89%	57%	32%	51%	38%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	83%	60%	23%	56%	27%
	2018	95%	62%	33%	58%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
09	2019	84%	64%	20%	55%	29%
	2018	95%	56%	39%	53%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
10	2019	98%	59%	39%	53%	45%
	2018	86%	58%	28%	53%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	98%	55%	43%	60%	38%
	2018	98%	58%	40%	61%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	98%	60%	38%	55%	43%
	2018	100%	63%	37%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	100%	62%	38%	54%	46%
	2018	98%	55%	43%	54%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	95%	63%	32%	46%	49%
	2018	97%	62%	35%	45%	52%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	87%	61%	26%	53%	34%
	2018	84%	63%	21%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	83%	58%	25%	48%	35%
	2018	95%	62%	33%	50%	45%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	82%	18%	71%	29%
2018	98%	79%	19%	71%	27%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	77%	21%	70%	28%
2018	86%	75%	11%	68%	18%
Compare		12%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	72%	26%	61%	37%
2018	100%	80%	20%	62%	38%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	70%	-70%	56%	-56%

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	27	30	77	54	55					
HSP	82	60									
MUL	80										
WHT	90	65	67	98	89	80	89	100	78	100	100

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
FRL	100	91		100	92		91				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	58	64	93	77	80					
WHT	90	71	71	99	86	94	94	92	51	100	100
FRL	100	69		100	93		100				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	45		83	92	90					
HSP	70			100							
WHT	89	71	71	98	86	87	89	98	21	100	100

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	86
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	950
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	87
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	95
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

ELA% Learning Gains 65. Reduced number of students performing at levels 3 and above in 7th, 8th and 9th grades. Lower number of students scoring at 10 on the writing exam in 8th, 9th and 10th grades.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

ELA. Reduced number of students performing at levels 3 and above in 7th, 8th and 9th grades. Lower number of students scoring at 10 on the writing exam in 8th, 9th and 10th grades.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

We rank above all state averages

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Middle School Acceleration showed a growth of 24 points.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance and course failures.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Reading
2. Behavior
3. Parent Involvement
4. PLC
5. ELA Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Learning Gains and Achievement in ELA
<b>Rationale</b>	To improve student performance and increase school grade points.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Majority of students will demonstrate gains in ELA. Improve gains by 2% from 90% to 92%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Scott O'Prey (opreys@seasideschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Intensive Reading - Achieve 3000 25 book goal Quarterly FSA writing prompts
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Increase student lexile level through a multi-tiered support system Increase student reading and vocabulary exposure through a variety of teacher and student selected works Increase student practice for writing for academic purpose
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Determine students who need intensive reading through FSA, STAR, Achieve 3000, and teacher recommendation 2. Increase classroom libraries 3. Improve data collection and progress monitoring practices 4. Provide teachers with time to grade and provide feedback to students on FSA writing prompts 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Scott O'Prey (opreys@seasideschools.net)
<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Parent Involvement
<b>Rationale</b>	Increase parent involvement in school activities, including improved better documentation
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	SNS will increase parent involvement volunteer hours from 402 hours to 500 hours.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Scott O'Prey (opreys@seasideschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Initiate Raptor program to document hours Develop google form for self monitored volunteer hours
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Increasing parent involvement enhances student achievement by supporting and encouraging students
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Purchase Raptor program 2. Provide a calendar of volunteer opportunities to MS and HS parents 3. Review parent records at mid year 4. Send letter/email encouraging families to complete required hours 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Scott O'Prey (opreys@seasideschools.net)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Streamline Student Behavior Documentation
<b>Rationale</b>	Streamline documentation of student behaviors in an effort to decrease/prevent negative behaviors in the future.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will increase the number of small group interactions(tier 2) offered to students determined by the school-based Google Behavior Tracking Form. We will increase the number of small intervention groups from zero to two. School based guidance counselors will be responsible for running the small groups on each campus.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Stacey Creter (creters@sesasideschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Consistent reporting of behavior data will give guidance counselors clear data that will direct them to the areas students are needing help with. The school-based form will also indicate students who are in need of additional behavior supports. Small group interventions will allow for intentional instruction on targeted issues.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Better student behavior increases student academic performance in the classroom and overall school grade.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create school-based Google Behavior Form</li> <li>2. Review form and documentation procedures with teachers for consistent use and data recording.</li> <li>3. Review data on a monthly bases to determine small group needs, students needing support, grade level needs.</li> <li>4. Implement Ripple Effects for Tier 2 intervention and Advantage Press for Tier 3 interventions.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Candace Carlson (carlsonc@seasideschools.net)



<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Professional Learning Communities
<b>Rationale</b>	Seaside Schools staff will participate in Teach with your Strengths book study. Our belief is to develop teacher talents to improve student outcomes.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase student self awareness by the creation of a student strengths portfolio.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kim Mixson (mixsonk@seasideschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The Clifton Youth Strengths Explorer survey to identify student individual strengths.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students will gather ideas for using their unique talents to unlock their potential and receive a personalized results report that identifies their top three talent themes based on their responses
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purchase program books and tests for teachers</li> <li>2. purchase student tests Clifton Youth Strengths Explorer</li> <li>2. Introduce to staff</li> <li>3. Develop course for PAEC complete through Google classroom</li> <li>4. students will create their Strengths Portfolio</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kim Mixson (mixsonk@seasideschools.net)
<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Career Education and Planning
<b>Rationale</b>	Assist all middle and high school students in exploring career options and developing an academic and career plan.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students will develop a career and education plan that includes short and long-term goals, high school program of study, and post-secondary/career goals by the completion of the 8th grade.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kim Mixson (mixsonk@seasideschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Complete lessons in My Career Shines modules, including a career portfolio which demonstrates students' short and long-term goals.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	My Career Shines program is endorsed by the Florida DOE and is complete with an Educator's Toolkit to provide the training and student planning activities.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the History and Career Planning course code for 8th gr</li> <li>2. Obtain My Career Shines career and education planning tool</li> <li>3. incorporate lesson plans for each module throughout the year</li> <li>4. Each student will complete portfolio by end of 8th grade</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kim Mixson (mixsonk@seasideschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

**Part V: Budget**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains and Achievement in ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Streamline Student Behavior Documentation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Career Education and Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00