# Brooksville Elementary School

**2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Brooksville Elementary School

## 885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

## https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2017-18 Title I School** | **2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-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 | 33% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | B | C | B* |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.**

Our mission is to "Make Every Moment Count for Every Child, Every Day!"

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

Brooksville Elementary is a School of Career Studies. Dream Big, Explore More.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title |
|------|-------|
| Lastra, Mike | Principal |
| Benard, Daiquiri | Other |
| DeNote, Carrie | Instructional Coach |
| Peeler, Lisa | Administrative Support |
| Gibson, Patricia | Instructional Coach |
| Inmon, RIchard | Assistant Principal |
| Boyer, Miranda | Attendance/Social Work |
| Jernigan, Kristi | School Counselor |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

Mike Lastra (Principal) and Richard (RJ) Inmon (Assistant Principal) facilitate data analysis, acquire the resources to deliver standards-based instruction and engage in purposeful action steps that are intended to increase student achievement in the school.

Patricia Gibson serves as the ELA Instructional Coach for teachers in grades K-5. Patricia models lessons weekly on the specials rotation, provides side-by-side coaching and professional development. She is the BES representative on the district ELA committee. Patricia is also the chair of
the Literacy Leadership team.

Daiquiri Benard is the assessment teacher. Daiquiri coordinates all assessment at the school and provides the team with the data to be analyzed. She collaborates with teachers during PLC's regarding the use of data to drive instructional decision-making.

Carrie DeNote works as the Math Resource Teacher. Carrie teaches students effective instructional math
practice through weekly specials rotations. Carrie heads the Math Leadership Team.

Amy Anderson serves as the Title I Facilitator at BES. Amy has past experience as both a classroom

teacher and an elementary specialist. She helps to research and acquire resources to meet the needs of the teachers and students.

Miranda Boyer has the role of school-based social worker/guidance counselor. Miranda analyzes attendance data and conducts the truancy proceedings. Perpetually, BES has the goal of increasing on-time attendance. Miranda conducts interviews and home visits with the purpose of increasing parent awareness of the timely attendance of their children.

Kristi Jernigan works as a school-based behavior specialist/guidance counselor. Kristi analyzes discipline data, provides intervention directly and coaches teachers on stronger classroom management. Miranda and Kristi both provide classroom guidance through the specials rotation.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

**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 | 6 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 30 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 3 | 9 | 19 | 29 | 25 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |

**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 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**Date this data was collected**
Tuesday 9/18/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Year 2016-17 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

ELA lowest 25% percentile. This is not a trend.
2016 43%
2017 62%
2018 44%

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

4th Grade ELA (-23%)
ELA lowest 25th percentile dropped from 62% to 44%

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

ELA Learning gains.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Math lowest 25th percentile went up 5% points. Yes this is a trend
2016 31%
2017 44%
2018 49%

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Math Resource Teacher working with small groups (bottom 25%)

**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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 50% | 55% | 56% | 46% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 53% | 55% | 50% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 51% | 48% | 43% | 40% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 63% | 62% | 62% | 63% | 63% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | 53% | 59% | 61% | 58% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 43% | 47% | 31% | 43% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 58% | 55% | 53% | 54% | 51% |

| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 (0) | 25 (0) | 22 (0) | 22 (0) | 9 (0) | 18 (0) | 102 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (1) | 3 (0) | 7 (0) | 18 (0) | 14 (1) | 13 (1) | 55 (3) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 6 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 34 (0) | 30 (0) | 37 (0) | 101 (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.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 60% | 62% | -2% | 57% | 3% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2017 | 55% | 61% | -6% | 58% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 43% | 53% | -10% | 56% | -13% |
| | 2017 | 66% | 55% | 11% | 56% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 55% | -6% |
| | 2017 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 53% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -17% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 56% | 67% | -11% | 62% | -6% |
| | 2017 | 62% | 66% | -4% | 62% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 71% | 60% | 11% | 62% | 9% |
| | 2017 | 60% | 66% | -6% | 64% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 61% | 56% | 5% | 61% | 0% |
| | 2017 | 67% | 57% | 10% | 57% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 55% | -6% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 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 | 24 | 38 | 42 | 38 | 49 | 36 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 37 | 33 | 38 | 48 | 29 | 18 | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 57 | | 70 | 76 | | 42 | | | | |

| | | | **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 |
| MUL | 38 | 40 | | 40 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 49 | 45 | 69 | 69 | 56 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 49 | 45 | 59 | 65 | 50 | 44 | | | | |

| | | | **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 | 13 | 25 | 36 | 29 | 25 | 29 | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 41 | | 42 | 48 | 45 | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 74 | | 69 | 83 | | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 42 | | 67 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 64 | 69 | 66 | 65 | 41 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 57 | 58 | 61 | 60 | 37 | 58 | | | | |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

| Activity #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Revival of reading strategies |
| **Rationale** | ELA Scores in all school grade categories at BES dropped in 2017-18. Most specifically in 4th grade (-23%). |
| **Intended Outcome** | Increase ELA scores in all FSA school grade categories.<br>ELA proficiency: 5%<br>Learning Gains: 7%<br>Bottom 25th percentile: 9% |
| **Point Person** | Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | Bi weekly grade level PLCs will focus on reading strategies (before/during/after). Each PLC will focus on a different reading strategy. ELA Coach will lead each PLC. Administration will purchase copies of "The Reading Strategies Book; Your Everyday Guide To Reading" for each grade level to be used as a resource during PLCs and team planning. Model classrooms will be placed on the Pineapple Chart so that other teachers can observe exemplar classrooms incorporating reading strategies. |
| **Person Responsible** | Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | For each grade level PLC Administration will be present to monitor fidelity and implenmtation of the strategies from "The Reading Strategies Book". ELA coach will be designing a walkthrough data collection tool to be used during pineapple chart visits, coaches walkthroughs, and learning walks. This data will be shared with the team during PLCs. We will also use this data to determine the topic of our ELA PLCs. Administrative walkthroughs will also check for fidelity. |
| **Person Responsible** | Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Personalized/ Technology Infused PD |
| **Rationale** | Teachers at BES have access to many forms of technology. Each hallway has a computer lab and 16 classes are currently 1:1 with devices (laptop/tablet). Based on walkthrough data, many teachers are using technology at the lowest level (substitution/support software).<br>Creating a culture of collaboration will increase the amount of teachers that are utilizing the latest tools in ed tech. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Increase school grade from a C to a B with teachers transforming their practice through collaboration, personalized learning, and technology integration. |
| **Point Person** | Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Every other Thursday there will be a 1 hour after school Tech-Mex PD. Each PD will be focused on a different ed tech platform and the training's will be voluntary. Administration will provide different forms of ethnic food (to go with the Tech-Mex theme). Faculty will know ahead of time what platforms will be covered.<br>Early release days will be in edcamp form. Teachers will have multiple options of PD sessions to attend. These sessions will be focused on areas of need determined by faculty input. |
| **Person Responsible** | Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | We will utilize a Pineapple Chart to showcase model classrooms and encourage teacher collaboration. Pineapple Chart is completely voluntary, teachers that need coverage to see certain classrooms will be provided that coverage by admin/coaches. Teachers that participate in the Pineapple chart only need to sign in. Since there are no PD in-service points awarded they will not need to submit any artifacts. We will use Flipgrid to submit follow up activities and continue the learning. Our coaches have created a FLipgrid page for teachers to share what they have been working on in the classroom and to have a platform for collaboration without ever needing to schedule times. |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

# 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 Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 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.**

BES has a very active group of volunteers contribute nearly 150 hours per week of volunteer support in classrooms, on the grounds, in the office and on specials projects. Operation Heartfelt is a local non-profit organization that provides needy families with food backpacks to provide food staples on the weekend. Business partnerships include McDonald's, Cemex, and Goodwin. Each of these businesses in its own way contributes to supplies, on-campus events, foods, fundraisers, etc. Funds from these activities support student achievement through providing awards, incentives, activities, and celebrations when students have improved their performance.

### 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.**

As a PBS School, BES provides education with regard to expectations for each area of the campus; classroom, bus, playground, cafeteria, media center. Each month has a particular focus which is selected by the PBS Team based upon data from the previous year. Students who display expectations are reinforced randomly with tickets, which they can then trade in for Kool Kat Koins. Kool Kat Koins can be used to purchase needed school supplies, admission into activities, purchase of snacks, etc.

Both the School Social Worker and School Behavior Specialist are on the wheel rotation. Therefore 12 classes per week have a session with their counselors. Discipline data are reviewed by SBLT at every meeting. Students who have serious or repeated disciplines are identified as students who need tiered supports for behavioral/emotional/social needs. Identified students receive interventions designed to match their particular struggles. Behavioral interventions used include, but are not limited to, Check-in/check-out, mentoring, targeted groups, social personal class, infused social skills, individual behavioral interventions, functional behavior analyses and individual behavior intervention plans.

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

Kindergarten roundup occurs in the spring before the child enters Kindergarten. The campus is open for parents and potential students to explore the campus and get to know some of the staff. Students in attendance at roundup are screened to determine entry level skills. Student placement balances classes in terms of academic knowledge and behavior. At the beginning of the school year, an open house opportunity is provided to incoming Kindergarteners. A future practice has been added for Kindergarten students and their parents will be to have a separate Kindergarten open house. This way children can come, meet their teacher and have a tour of the campus so they may be less anxious upon their arrival to school. For the first three days, Kindergarten parents are allowed to walk with their child to class in the morning.

Collaboration with schools which are receiving exiting 5th grade students includes visits from guidance counselors to describe a day in the life of a 6th grader at the respective receiving schools. These schools hold open campus events to afford new 6th graders the opportunity to familiarize themselves with their new school environment. Our main feeder middle school Principal will conduct campus visits each semester to speak with 5th grade students about middle school expectations.

**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.**

Before school begins in the Fall, available members of the SBLT conduct a data analysis of available performance data: attendance, discipline, walkthrough, FCAT Science, EOC, iReady ELA, and iReady math. Priorities for PD are generated from this analysis. Areas for intervention are targeted. An inventory of intervention materials is conducted and any shortages of intervention supplies are ordered. A master schedule is created that provides adequate time for all curricular areas, supplemental lab time and scheduled blocks for Tier II and/or Tier III support.

Once school resumes, the Principal, Mike Lastra, establishes a schedule of bi-weekly SBLT meetings during which all available data are reviewed. Team Leaders meet with SBLT on a bi-weekly schedule as well. At the Team Leaders meeting, weekly assessment data are reviewed and problem solving activities occur whenever mastery learning has not occurred -- 80% or more of students achieve 70% or better on the weekly assessment of the standard. Reteaching and differentiation are focuses of problem-solving for this school year. The Principal will also meet on the alternating Tuesdays with the instructional team (AP, Coaches, Assessment) to further dissagregate data.

Targeted problem-solving focused on expenditure of Title I funds is a focus of the SBLT for this school year as well. Return on investment analysis for expensive software purchases is being conducted in an effort to determine to what degree students benefit from participation with the program. The Title I Facilitator, Amy Anderson has been charged with exploring other options.

Prior to scheduling a student for Individual Problem Solving (IPS), teachers are asked to meet with their team to problem-solve student performance issues. A checklist, created by Miranda Boyer, provides a structure and documentation of the teams' reviews of student performance. Teachers, through the team process, are free to move students into or out of Tier II supports depending upon the data. Students only move into or out of Tier III supports through the IPS meetings. The IPS review team consists of Mike Lastra, Principal, Miranda Boyer, School Social Worker-Academic RtI, Kristi Jernnigan, School Behavior Specialist --Behavior RtI and Allison Gibson, School Psychologist.The IPS Team meets weekly.

**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