

Orange County Public Schools

Wekiva High



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Wekiva High

2501 N HIAWASSEE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

<https://wekivahs.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Kenisha Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Wekiva High

2501 N HIAWASSEE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

<https://wekivahs.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>82%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>82%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

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.

To lead students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

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
Erickson, Michele	Principal	The principal is responsible for all aspects of the day-to day operation of the school.
Kispert, George	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for supporting curriculum areas, providing feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices to increase student achievement, and to assist the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school as needed.
Ellison, Gwendolynn	Instructional Coach	The duties of the Instructional Coach are to support and mentor teachers. This includes coaching, model teaching, conducting peer observations, researching additional strategies and information to assist teachers, data gathering, and facilitating data data progress monitoring meetings.
Brown-Griffin, Keshia	Dean	The responsibilities of the dean are to assist teachers with classroom management skills so that students can meet with optimal success in all classrooms.
Tolbert, Deana	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for supporting curriculum areas, providing feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices to increase student achievement, and to assist the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school as needed.
Miller, Saraya	Assistant Principal	
Alvarado, Ben	Assistant Principal	
Washington, Doyle	Dean	
Morrell, Donnell	Dean	
Phillips, Taquesia	Instructional Coach	
Martinez, Daniel	Instructional Coach	
Coffey-Wilson, La'Tanya	Other	
Williams, Lettita	Instructional Coach	

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	0	0	0	0	0	591	579	517	522	2209
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	144	137	323	718
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	174	78	85	518
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	287	237	163	993
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	258	150	54	708

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	0	0	226	271	183	184	864

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	4	28	16	11	59
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	16	28	67

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

114

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	0	0	0	0	148	166	156	150	620
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	121	81	66	405
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	307	247	140	1010
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	213	30	21	550
07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	278	247	142	97	764

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	0	0	0	148	166	156	150	620
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	121	81	66	405
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	307	247	140	1010
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	213	30	21	550
07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	278	247	142	97	764

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	41%	55%	56%	39%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	53%	51%	45%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	40%	42%	31%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	43%	51%	18%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	35%	49%	48%	22%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	46%	45%	26%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	61%	70%	68%	67%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	73%	73%	60%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	591 (0)	579 (0)	517 (0)	522 (0)	2209 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	114 (148)	144 (166)	137 (156)	323 (150)	718 (620)
One or more suspensions	181 (137)	174 (121)	78 (81)	85 (66)	518 (405)
Course failure in ELA or Math	306 (316)	287 (307)	237 (247)	163 (140)	993 (1010)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	246 (286)	258 (213)	150 (30)	54 (21)	708 (550)

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
09	2019	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	67%	-8%	67%	-8%
2018	52%	62%	-10%	65%	-13%
Compare		7%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	69%	-4%	70%	-5%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	68%	-7%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	63%	-42%	61%	-40%
2018	18%	61%	-43%	62%	-44%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	53%	-25%	57%	-29%
2018	38%	65%	-27%	56%	-18%
Compare		-10%			

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	17	29	23	18	28	32	25	50		82	17
ELL	22	39	35	22	35	22	44	48		78	40
ASN	64	52		25	33		85	73		100	56
BLK	34	37	31	20	33	32	53	62		91	33
HSP	39	42	38	29	37	29	59	67		92	52
MUL	54	54		36	33		80	69		89	44
WHT	58	49	22	43	37		80	80		94	64
FRL	35	37	33	25	32	28	55	62		91	43

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	17	32	29	21	23	18	28	37		73	31
ELL	14	34	38	11	16		33	30		80	33
ASN	53	53		50	40		71	85		100	64
BLK	38	44	38	26	31	32	48	53		90	33
HSP	39	49	34	30	30	35	56	56		89	46
MUL	66	66		47	31		62	78		91	40
WHT	54	54	35	42	28	13	66	74		93	63
FRL	42	48	36	31	30	31	55	61		90	40

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	14	31	29	12	24	29	35	41		75	27
ELL	15	33	28	12	23	28	64	29		62	33
ASN	76	83		38	33		92	80		100	75
BLK	33	42	28	15	23	26	56	54		86	28
HSP	34	41	32	16	22	24	69	58		85	35
MUL	44	52		16	17		67	60		86	42

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
WHT	52	51	46	24	22	23	83	74		92	63
FRL	39	45	31	18	22	26	67	60		86	39

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	57
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	53
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	46
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Algebra. Algebra scores have been inconsistent over the past four years (2016=16%, 2017=14%, 2018= 18%, 2019= 21%). Contributing factors include the long term leave of a team member and the performance of our feeder elementary and middle schools. This factor has been a concern and a topic of collaboration amongst our schools, with the goal being strong preparation resulting in a solid foundation for the students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in the area of English Language Arts Learning Gains. The major contributing factor for this decline was the loss of instructional personnel, resulting in multiple classes not having a qualified instructor for a large part of the school year.

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.

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of Algebra. The contributing factor appears to be that students are deficient in basic math skills.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement are the areas of Social Studies and Science. Some of the contributing factors include stability of instructional staff which led to a stronger Professional Learning Community cohesiveness, as well as the increased use by the teachers of the district provided Curriculum Resource Materials and other state resources. Support also included consistent walking of classrooms and input/coaching from district support and content specific personnel.

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

In reviewing the EWS data, there are two major areas of concern. The areas of concern are high attendance rates below 90% and high number of course failures in ELA and Math.

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

1. Math scores
2. English Language Arts scores
3. Providing increased support for students with disabilities
4. Providing increased support for students who are English language learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	District Professional Learning Community
Rationale	All content areas should be taking part in close reading, answering text dependent questions, and writing activities. Students need to be provided with instruction and practice with these strategies to become proficient in order to ensure career and college readiness as well as support English Language Arts standards that are incorporated in every subject area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The use of close reading, answering text dependent questions, and writing activities will assist with increasing the test scores in English Language Arts by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will assist students examine their reasoning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students' analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances their long term retention and problem-solving abilities related to critical content.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development and training opportunities through the use of face-to-face trainings, on-line trainings, as well as district provided training opportunities. 2. Teachers will be provided with support in the area of data analyzation, looking at instructional practices, and assisted with making the necessary adjustments to improve student outcomes, including the instructional programs for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and by district personnel. 3. Teachers will be provided assistance with developing a systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports including planning supports before instruction, as well as providing suggestions for supports that are available for use for on-the spot support during instruction. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and by district personnel. 4. Teachers will be provided assistance with planning for standards based instruction through the use of Professional Learning Communities, instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel. 5. Teachers will be provided with ongoing feedback and coaching by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Student Achievement on State Mandated Assessments
Rationale	Wekiva High School's state assessment areas have been inconsistent over the past few years, with some areas showing modest growth, some remaining stagnant, and others falling in performance levels. However, the data indicates that the scores on the assessments are still far below the expected achievement levels, including the scores for our English Language Learners and Students with disabilities. By assisting teachers with the consistent use of data to guide, support, and differentiate instruction, all students can progress to the intended level of complexity.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Wekiva High School will see an overall increase of at least 5% in each of the various high-stake achievement assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Helping students process new content, with students systematically engaging to process content in order for meaning to occur.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will be provided with support in the area of using strategies that activate or build background knowledge. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel. 2. Teachers will be provided with strategies to teach students to generalize and maintain newly acquired knowledge and skills. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel. 3. Teachers will make use of explicit instruction when students are learning new material and complex skills and concepts. Support and suggested strategies will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel. 4. Staff members will collaborate in order to support student learning toward measurable outcomes and to design and implement educational programs for all students. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel. 5. Staff members will utilize systems to analyze data to make adjustments in order to improve student outcomes for all students. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, leadership team members, and district personnel.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.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).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: District Professional Learning Community	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Achievement on State Mandated Assessments	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------