

Polk County Public Schools

# Lena Vista Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>12</b> |

## Lena Vista Elementary School

925 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/lenavista>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 50%   |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

We, at Lena Vista Elementary, strive to empower students in a nurturing environment with rigorous instruction that promotes academic excellence.

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

100% Student Success

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name               | Title               |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Sharp, Deneece     | Principal           |
| Larson-Pease, Erin | Instructional Coach |
| Jergensen, Jane    | Instructional Media |
| Snyder, Windy      | Instructional Coach |
| Bergwall, Shauna   | Assistant Principal |
| Williams, Hunter   | Dean                |

#### Duties

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

Members of the School Based Leadership Team assist with the development of the SIP. The team provides strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. They help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). Information is used to understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward.

### 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     | 89          | 87 | 72 | 78 | 73 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 482   |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 1  | 3  | 11 | 19 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 2  | 0  | 10 | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 33 | 50 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 122   |

**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 | 2           | 2 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

**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     | 14          | 25 | 21 | 31 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145   |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected**

Thursday 7/19/2018

**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     | 23          | 21 | 20 | 18 | 32 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 12 | 18 | 9  | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 12          | 2  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 14 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 73    |

**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 | 4           | 2 | 2 | 12 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |

**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     | 23          | 21 | 20 | 18 | 32 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 12 | 18 | 9  | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 12          | 2  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 14 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 73    |

**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 | 4           | 2 | 2 | 12 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |

## 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?

4th grade learning gains (including lowest 25%) was the lowest performing data component. This is a trend from previous years.

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

3rd and 4th grade math proficiency showed the greatest decline from prior year.  
4th grade math showed a 17% decline and 3rd grade math showed a 13% decline.

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

4th grade math and language arts had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.  
4th grade math had a 28% gap and 4th grade ELA had a 27% gap.

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

5th Grade had improvement in ELA and Math learning gains. This is not a trend from previous years.  
5th grade showed a 4% increase in ELA and a 20% increase in math.

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

Professional Learning Communities that enabled teachers to instruct on the intent of the standard with a focus on cognitive complexity and student autonomy. Staff also worked on creating engaging classrooms with focus on student engagement activities in the classroom. Behavior and Attendance also was monitored and supported through Positive behavior classrooms.

### 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             | 40%    | 50%      | 56%   | 44%    | 48%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 44%    | 51%      | 55%   | 47%    | 49%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 48%    | 45%      | 48%   | 40%    | 42%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 43%    | 58%      | 62%   | 52%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 47%    | 56%      | 59%   | 53%    | 52%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 29%    | 44%      | 47%   | 44%    | 41%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 46%    | 53%      | 55%   | 34%    | 46%      | 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     | 89 (23)                           | 87 (21) | 72 (20) | 78 (18) | 73 (32) | 83 (15) | 482 (129) |
| One or more suspensions         | 2 (3)                             | 1 (12)  | 3 (18)  | 11 (9)  | 19 (22) | 5 (10)  | 41 (74)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (12)                            | 2 (2)   | 0 (4)   | 10 (0)  | 6 (0)   | 3 (0)   | 21 (18)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 33 (14) | 50 (21) | 39 (38) | 122 (73)  |

#### 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 | 38%    | 51%      | -13%                       | 57%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 41%    | 53%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 29%    | 48%      | -19%                       | 56%   | -27%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 38%    | 51%      | -13%                       | 56%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 42%    | 50%      | -8%                        | 55%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 38%    | 44%      | -6%                        | 53%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 36%    | 56%      | -20%                       | 62%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 49%    | 58%      | -9%                        | 62%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 34%    | 57%      | -23%                       | 62%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 51%    | 60%      | -9%                        | 64%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -17%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 52%    | 56%      | -4%                        | 61%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 32%    | 47%      | -15%                       | 57%   | -25%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2018 | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                        | 55%   | -9%                     |
|                   | 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                                       | 16       | 23     | 33          | 17        | 28      | 26           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 31       | 38     |             | 31        | 37      | 23           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 18       | 40     | 56          | 31        | 40      | 31           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 52     | 40          | 39        | 38      | 14           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 41     | 48          | 49        | 54      | 39           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 43     | 48          | 41        | 46      | 30           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       | 20     | 27          | 14        | 42      | 57           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 47     | 45          | 37        | 41      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 24       | 44     | 38          | 25        | 27      | 31           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 47     | 57          | 43        | 45      | 54           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 47       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 41     | 29          | 50        | 38      | 29           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 39     | 36          | 40        | 38      | 35           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Standards Driven Instruction for Learning Gains   |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Data trends show over the past 2 years that Lena Vista has not increased or established proficient growth in the core instruction in both ELA and Math.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | <p>To increase proficiency and growth in ELA and Math by 5%. The Ignite Core Instruction PD series will be used to empower teachers to increase student ownership and cognitive engagement, which is proven to raise student achievement and make teaching more engaging.</p> <p>Ignite blends training, coaching, and a suite of classroom and leadership tools to produce sustainable transformations (with visible next-day results) in core instruction.</p> <p>Ignite Core Instruction is designed to help students increase their active cognitive engagement and critical thinking skills, which are necessary to attain to the rigor of the new academic standards and skills necessary to thrive in the new economy.</p> |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)   |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | <p>Learning Science International will provide 4 Professional Learning Communities (PLC) through the Igniting Series with all staff, Leadership Support Virtual Sessions and 7 Coaching for Implementations PLC's.</p> <p>PLC's and training will consist of:</p> <p>Practical, hands-on training where teachers leave with skills to use in their next-day lessons. (Dates of training are 8/7, 9/17, 11/7, 2/15)</p> <p>Coaching for Implementation that connects the professional learning to immediate classroom actions to ensure next-day implementation results and builds the capacity of school-based coaches to help lead this work. (7 - Dates to be decided on 8/7)</p>   |
|                               | <p>School leadership side-by-side coaching to build the vision, inspection and feedback skills necessary for the principal to support the focus on rigorous, student-centered core instruction (6 - Dates to be decided on 8/7)</p>   |
|                               | <p>Virtual sessions are to provide implementation support to leaders. Coaches and school leaders look at the tool taught in the training, review building data collected by the principal prior to the session, and determine action steps for the leadership team to increase implementation across classrooms. (4 - Dates to be decided on 8/7)</p>   |
|                               | <p>Administration will support and follow-up LSI sessions in all PLC trainings and Grade Level Planning sessions.</p> <p>The Leadership Team will review data on a regular basis to pinpoint areas of need and address those needs through the coaching cycle, interventions with students, and after-school learning opportunities.</p>  |
|                               |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Administration and Leadership Team will monitor teacher instructional fidelity through the coaching cycle, teacher observations, and teacher evaluation. Also, STAR and IStation data will be gathered quarterly or as assigned by the district to monitor student effectiveness and/or growth.   |

**Person Responsible** Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

## Activity #2

**Title** Monitor for Effectiveness

**Rationale** To establish systems for monitoring the effectiveness of teacher instruction and professional learning designed through the Ignite (LSI) program.

**Intended Outcome** The intended outcome of the tracker training is to have the:  
\*Ability to brainstorm next steps in improving practice as instructional leaders  
\*Ability to discuss coaching for growth and nuances of the coaching and feedback tool and cycle  
\*Learning ways to provide specific feedback for growth

**Point Person** Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

## Action Step

**Description** Staff will use LSI Growth Tracker, Standards Tracker and Trend Tracker to make sure students and instruction are at an appropriate rigor level. These real-time metrics to help lead and support classroom implementation, including:  
LSI Standards Tracker™, which helps teachers focus on evidence of standards in core instruction and monitor student progress through examination of student evidences (Dates of training to be determined 8/7)  
LSI Growth Tracker™, which empowers teachers, coaches, and professional learning communities (PLCs) with the tools and metrics to see video examples, facilitate peer support, and award micro-credentials for teachers showing implementation evidence for their classrooms (Dates of training to be determined 8/7)  
LSI Trend Tracker, which allows administrators to track current patterns and trends in classrooms, while identifying school-wide areas of need to take focused action and build a strategy for school improvement. (Dates of training to be determined 9/11)

**Person Responsible** Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** STAR and IStation data will be gathered quarterly or as assigned by the district to monitor student effectiveness and/or growth as related to measures from LSI Standards Tracker and Growth Tracker.

**Person Responsible** Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

## 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, 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.**

Lena Vista will host grade level family nights in order to provide parents the needed tools to help their children at home, to the extent feasible and appropriate, in order to move students forward in the areas of Language Arts, math, science and technology.

#### **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.**

Lena Vista uses a school-wide PBS plan, CHAMPS and Keys to Character program to meet the social-emotional needs of students. Students who require further intervention in this area may receive a daily check-in/check-out intervention at the Tier 2 level of support. Students requiring more intervention will receive Tier 3 level of support, which could lead to further evaluation and possible Exceptional Student Education services (ESE). ESE students and 504 students are eligible for mental health counseling. The school counselor will monitor behavioral data that is entered by classroom teachers using the RTIB database and will intervene as needed using research-based behavioral interventions.

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

Lena Vista Elementary assists Pre-K students in their transition to elementary school. Our school provides two Exceptional Student Education classes and Early Intervention Pre-K. Throughout the course of the year, Pre-Kindergarten students participate in school-wide programs that provide them with literature and information to make the transition into kindergarten a smooth process. In the spring, families are invited to participate in Kindergarten Round-Up. During round-up families are taken on a campus tour then presented with school information, which is delivered by the administration, the reading coach, and kindergarten teachers. Materials from Title I and Success by Six are distributed to provide parents with information and practical strategies for children from birth to six years of age. Families are invited to the event through the use of local and social media, Title 1 newsletters, and SchoolMessenger. Pre-K teachers use various techniques (observation, assessment, parent feedback), to monitoring the students' readiness. FLKRS is administered at the onset of the kindergarten school year. The data is disaggregated and the results aid in creating a target list of students who are labeled as high risk. Students who are found to have low readiness rates are monitored and provided additional support. Reading and Math/Science Coaches work with teachers in planning lessons that accommodate the learning modalities of the high-risk students, as well as assisting in the constant monitoring of students' progress. Parent feedback is another tool used to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions in place. Kindergarten and Pre-Kindergarten teachers will collaborate with one another to monitor student progress in achieving readiness skills.

#### **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.**

Baseline Data: STAR Assessments, FSA

Progress Monitoring: STAR, IStation, Math Modules Assessments, Reading Wonders Unit Assessments, Tier II and Tier III progress Monitoring (Math Probes, Progress Monitoring Writing, Wonders Assessments, Behavior Charts, etc.)

Midyear: STAR

End of year: STAR, FSA

Frequency of Data Days: STAR-Quarterly, FSA-Yearly, Tier II and Tier III (As Defined by Intervention

Plan)

Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Lena Vista. Funds provide supplemental instructional resources for students with academic needs. This program supports after-school instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, Interventionists, a network manager, technology, academic coaches for professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.

Migrant students will be assisted by the school and by District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students are prioritized by the MEP for services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor progress of students and provide/coordinate academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and families for the MEP. They provide support to students and parents in locating services to ensure the success of students whose education has been interrupted.

PD resources are available to schools through Title II funds. School Technology Services provides support, PD in the areas of math, language arts, science, and technology.

Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff.

The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for homeless students. Title I provides support for this program and many activities implemented by the Hearth program is carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C.

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

Lena Vista uses partnerships with local businesses to promote career awareness. Our SAC committee includes community members. Our Great American Teach-In encourages community members to visit our school to share their career information with students on an annual basis.

## Part V: Budget

Total:

**\$361,419.68**