

Duval County Public Schools

Hidden Oaks Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hidden Oaks Elementary School

6127 CEDAR HILLS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.duvalschools.org/hiddenoaks

Demographics

Principal: Lawanda Polydore

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hidden Oaks Elementary School

6127 CEDAR HILLS BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.duvalschools.org/hiddenoaks

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Stonewall Jackson Elementary School's mission is to provide all children with a safe and supportive learning environment in which they will receive quality instruction and high quality learning experiences that would help them achieve academic success in all future endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Stonewall Jackson Elementary is to provide all students with qualitative standard-based instruction that will prepare them to experience success in a competitive world that is culturally diverse and technologically advanced.

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
Platts, Shawn	Principal	
Rowan-Thomas, Regina	Assistant Principal	

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	3	51	48	58	42	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	16	16	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	20	28	33	31	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

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	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/30/2019

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	31	24	13	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	57	48	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
	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	26	33	26	25	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	31	24	13	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	57	48	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
	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	26	33	26	25	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	31%	50%	57%	27%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	42%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	62%	63%	55%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	48%	53%	27%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	3 (0)	51 (0)	48 (0)	58 (0)	42 (0)	54 (0)	256 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (31)	22 (24)	16 (13)	16 (20)	23 (13)	9 (12)	86 (113)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	4 (1)	4 (0)	8 (1)	3 (1)	1 (0)	20 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (4)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (57)	21 (48)	20 (34)	41 (139)

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
03	2019	30%	51%	-21%	58%	-28%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	20%	49%	-29%	56%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	18%	50%	-32%	56%	-38%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	64%	-21%	64%	-21%
	2018	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	23	31		27	23						
ELL	10										
BLK	31	55	44	40	58	56	20				
HSP	30										
WHT	37	55		63	64						
FRL	33	56	43	42	56	43	19				
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	19	15		19	46						
BLK	32	30	17	47	55	27	39				

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
WHT	25	27		65	53						
FRL	32	26	15	46	59	50	34				
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	10	40		30							
BLK	23	42	41	48	55	50	20				
WHT	30	33		70	73						
FRL	25	41	57	51	56	40	19				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	10
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	
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	43
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	42
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.

5th Grade Science showed the lowest performance with 22%. This sub-group of students was our lowest performing students as it relates to ELA Proficiency.

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

5th Grade Science showed the lowest performance with 22%. This sub-group of students was our lowest performing students as it relates to ELA Proficiency.

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.

5th grade Science had the greatest gap when compared to state average. State average is 53% and the school had 22% (-31%).

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

Bottom Quartile students in ELA showed the most improvement as we increased from 20% to 50% (+30%). We identified this sub-group of students early on in the school year and developed an Action Plan specific to the learning needs of these students. These students were pulled for additional support via small group pullout and push-in.

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

Students with less than 90% attendance is an area of concern.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. 5th Grade Science
4. BQ ELA
5. BQ Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	FSA Language Arts proficiency scores experienced a 1% decrease for the 2018-2019 school year while our BQ ELA students experienced a 30% increase from 2017-2018 (20%) to 2018-2019 (50%). Teachers must have additional support to provide rigorous, grade level standards based instruction for students. This instruction must also be differentiated based on the individual needs of students.
	If we focus on standards based grade level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students, student achievement will increase.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards based instruction daily via whole group as well as small group to decrease both reading and writing deficiencies. This will be accomplished through PD, specifically teaching teachers and support staff how to unpack standards to ensure lesson activities are aligned with state standard requirements for students to demonstrate standard mastery. In addition to PD, additional supplemental materials and programs will be implemented, K-2nd Reading Mastery Special Edition (RMSE) and 3rd-5th Corrective Reading for our students to assist with reading deficiencies.</p> <p>In addition, all Reading teachers will participate in a book study ("Great Habits Great Readers" A Practical Guide for K-4 Reading in the Light of Common Core to expose teachers to reading best practices.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	During the 2018-2019 school year Math proficiency experienced a 7% decrease dropping to 43%. This is twenty percentage points short of the state average (63%) and 19 percentage points short of the district average (62%). Teachers must have additional support to provide rigorous, grade level standards based instruction for students. This instruction must also be differentiated based on the individual needs of students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>If we focus on standards based grade level instruction and differentiated this instruction based on the individual needs of students, student achievement will increase.</p> <p>The intended outcome is for all students to receive standards based instruction daily via whole group as well as small group to decrease math deficiencies. This will be accomplished through PD, specifically teaching teachers and support staff how to unpack standards to ensure lesson activities are aligned with state standard requirements for students to demonstrate standard mastery. In addition to PD, additional supplemental materials and programs will be implemented, 2nd - 5th Acaletics for our students to assist with math deficiencies.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Regina Rowan-Thomas (rowan-thor@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Culture and Climate
Rationale	Through reviewing the data as well as individual/group conferences with teachers, parents and students, we were able to identify as a Leadership Team that we have students that have difficulty with peer mediation, specifically low self-esteem and conflict resolution
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is for our students to better understand how peer mediation can lead to positive interactions with peers as well as faculty and staff. Initial steps have been made to identify teachers that would like to serve as part of the Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) Team on our campus. In addition, we will have the support of our district Behavioral Support Staff to ensure we follow best practices in establishing our school-wide PBIS protocols for students and teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shawn Platts (plattss@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

NA

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.

PTA

SAC

Parent Night for Math and Science

Literacy Night

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

The guidance counselor (1) provides direct intervention services to identified student groups and collaborates with leadership in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support the needs of the students; (2) provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; (3) links community agencies and district staffing personnel to school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; (4) provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; (5) administers program support for ESOL and directs Section 504 plan management.

In addition, the district provided curriculum Second Steps, will be used to prevent violence among students. These lessons will be incorporated as needed to address our student's social and emotional needs.

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

In readiness for grade school, our kindergarten students are adequately prepared through exposure to the fundamentals of reading through various routines inherent in a balanced curriculum, such as Phonemic awareness instruction by M. Heggerty, Grade-specific Phonics instruction, High Frequency vocabulary words, Reading comprehension strategies. This ensure their transition to the next grade level is confident.

To bridge the achievement gap that could deter students' preparation to transition, we employ intervention programs and strategies. Among these are;

- 1.) The FLKRS/DAR/iReady and Achieve3000 assessments that helps the teachers build an academic profile for each student that would help inform individualized instruction in Reading, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.
- 2.) The aforementioned assessments serve as baseline for instructional support that will help address gaps in the student's level of readiness.
- 3.) A balanced literacy program is ensured through the new Florida State standards. Likewise a balanced mathematics curriculum helps prepare the Kindergarten students-5th grade in acquiring the skills necessary for meeting the demands of the next grade level.
- 4.) Adequate instructional support from the Baseline/Midyear/District/iReady/Achieve3000/FLKRS assessments in Math and Reading help prepare our K-5 students academically for this great task of transitioning from grade to grade. Teachers analyze the data from various assessments to target areas of instruction.
- 5.) Furthermore, incite-based field-trips at the end of the school year provided the necessary incentives for students in Kindergarten-4th grade to want to transition to the next grade level.
- 6.) School-wide rallies planned at the end of the school year equally help build the necessary excitement that motivate Kindergarten-4th grade students to long to return to our school in the the next grade level!
- 7.) Vertical planning among grade level teachers provide great opportunities to analyze data and the "readiness level" to plan instructional support for the new students accordingly.

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.

The school based MTSS Leadership Team meets with the School Advisory Council and utilizes previous year's data on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 targets. Deficient areas in the data are used to develop the SIP plan. The school based MTSS Leadership Team and the School Advisory Council meets and utilizes baseline and mid-year data on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to address the effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group instructional needs.

Title I, Part A Funds are used to provide additional academic support and learning opportunities to help low-achieving students in reading and math to master challenging curricular. Funds are used to provide professional development and school initiatives that will increase the effectiveness of teachers, principals, paraprofessionals, and parents. The school receives Title I funds for parental involvement to provide materials and trainings to help parents work with their children to improve their academic achievement. Title II in collaboration with Title I provides funding to improve the quality of teaching and principal leadership through recruitment, teacher training, professional development, teacher incentive pay, stipends, and supplemental resources to increase student achievement. Title III works collaboratively with Title I to provide funding to help students learn English so that they are able to benefit from the same academic courses as English speakers. The funding helps ELL students meet academic standards by providing training to teachers and staff, and aid in supplemental resources to increase student achievement.

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: English Language Arts	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture and Climate	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00