

Marion County Public Schools

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 9 |
| Title I Requirements | 11 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 13 |

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[no web address on file]

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 | 30% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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 are united in challenging students to reach their fullest potential in a safe, positive, caring environment which is conducive to teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community school for student-centered learning that provides a family-friendly environment in order to develop successful and well-rounded global leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Brodie, Cynthia | Principal |
| Hunt, Victoria | Assistant Principal |
| Curty, Marie-Elena | Instructional Coach |
| Kelly, Tammy | School Counselor |
| Suranni, Joseph | Dean |
| Carson, Georgiana | Instructional Coach |
| Rowe, Cristine | Teacher, K-12 |
| Briggs, Patricia | Teacher, K-12 |
| Carranza, Dorothy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Moore, Danielle | Teacher, K-12 |
| Strong, Karen | Teacher, K-12 |
| Andriola, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 |
| DeClerke, Elizabeth | Teacher, ESE |
| Suver, Gabrielle | Teacher, K-12 |
| Swor, Kristen | Psychologist |
| Powers, Linda | Attendance/Social Work |

Duties

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

The school based Leadership Team members as related to the school's MTSS and the SIP is comprised of the members of the Instructional Improvement Team.

Members and reasons for including are:

Principal, Mrs. Brodie- Oversee, delegate, and make final team decisions

Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Mrs. Hunt- administration for curriculum decisions; coordinate and collaborate with staff, and monitor progress

Student Services Manager, Mr. Suranni- for input into behavior reports and recommendations
Guidance Counselor, Ms. Kelly- for processes and clarification on staffing recommendations
Classroom Teacher- Directly involved with student being discussed
Content Area Specialists/Instructional Coaches: Marie-Elena Curty and Georgiana Carson- input into reading needs and resources
School Psychologist- for observation and testing input
Social Worker- for input and/or communication to or from parent
Behavior Specialist- for behavior and observation input
and others as needed.

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 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 21 | 12 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 9 | 8 | 26 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 51 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |

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 | 16 | 14 | 42 | 20 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |

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 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

Date this data was collected

Monday 8/13/2018

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 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 13 | 23 | 41 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 55 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

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 | 17 | 19 | 29 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |

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 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 13 | 23 | 41 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 55 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

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 | 17 | 19 | 29 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |

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?

The data component that performed the lowest is percent of lowest quartile making learning gains in ELA. No, this is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that performed the lowest is percent of lowest quartile making learning gains in ELA.

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

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average is Fifth Grade Math - there is a 19 point gap.

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

There currently is not a component that showed the most improvement, however, science stayed at the same percentage of proficiency.

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

NA

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 | 43% | 46% | 56% | 44% | 47% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | 44% | 55% | 47% | 49% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 37% | 48% | 42% | 47% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 48% | 49% | 62% | 56% | 48% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 44% | 46% | 59% | 48% | 47% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | 35% | 47% | 44% | 40% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 51% | 55% | 47% | 49% | 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 | 17 (13) | 15 (13) | 12 (17) | 21 (12) | 12 (12) | 24 (13) | 101 (80) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (4) | 6 (6) | 7 (9) | 16 (5) | 8 (5) | 24 (9) | 62 (38) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 9 (13) | 8 (23) | 26 (41) | 9 (12) | 2 (19) | 54 (108) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 60 (12) | 51 (55) | 55 (33) | 166 (100) |

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 | 43% | 46% | -3% | 57% | -14% |
| | 2017 | 47% | 50% | -3% | 58% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 51% | 43% | 8% | 56% | -5% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2017 | 50% | 52% | -2% | 56% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 38% | 46% | -8% | 55% | -17% |
| | 2017 | 37% | 47% | -10% | 53% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 62% | -13% |
| | 2017 | 41% | 48% | -7% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 49% | 47% | 2% | 62% | -13% |
| | 2017 | 68% | 55% | 13% | 64% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 42% | 50% | -8% | 61% | -19% |
| | 2017 | 40% | 45% | -5% | 57% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -26% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 44% | 49% | -5% | 55% | -11% |
| | 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 | 41 | 31 | 29 | 44 | 32 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 64 | | 35 | 43 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 50 | | 53 | 58 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 59 | | 50 | 46 | | 36 | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 43 | 27 | 47 | 44 | 35 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 44 | 26 | 48 | 45 | 37 | 43 | | | | |

| 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 | 24 | 32 | 45 | 37 | 41 | 33 | | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 38 | | 31 | 31 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 85 | | 45 | 54 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 55 | | 49 | 42 | 20 | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 46 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 52 | 52 | 54 | 49 | 44 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 54 | 52 | 52 | 47 | 42 | 43 | | | | |

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 | Instruction: Rigorous and Relevant Instruction |
| Rationale | After reviewing multiple pieces of data, the root cause analysis reveals that inconsistencies in the implementation of core curriculum in Tier 1 contributed to the problem. |
| Intended Outcome | If quality instruction is delivered at the Tier 1 level with differentiated instructional strategies, rigor to the depth of the standard, and relevant subject matter being taught, then the number of students proficient and making learning gains will increase, especially in the lowest quartile by a minimum of ten (10) percentage points in both reading and math. |
| Point Person | Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will provide ongoing professional development for faculty differentiated by individual teacher needs, including collaboration weekly (50 minute collaboration sessions twice a week) supported through the content area specialists. 2. Professional development is based off of interest survey as well as student data and trends among the grade level based on the student data. 3. Teachers are active members of the work through collaboration identifying learning outcomes and strategies which relate to the standards being taught. 4. Teachers review assessment data to guide instruction through data digs led by administration and content area specialists to make planning and instructional adjustments to meet learner academic goals. 5. Professional development presented by Curriculum Associates with iReady to train staff on productive and appropriate use of the program and utilize the data to differentiate instruction through use of online instruction pathways and Toolbox. 6. Increasing STEM related content across the curriculum giving a focus to informational text and technical literacy. 7. Paraprofessionals used for small group instruction utilizing differentiation strategies based on student needs. IReady Toolbox lessons and Lakeshore manipulatives will be utilized by paraprofessionals in small groups for targeted instruction and repetitive practice. |
| Person Responsible | Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data review with teachers utilizing quarterly assessments, iReady data, FSA, etc. assessing teacher awareness and ability and how to use it to drive instruction through planning. 2. Professional development survey for staff including paraprofessionals on topics that would be of interest and topics that are data driven differentiated by grade level to help ensure their personal growth is met for success. 3. Collaboration planning for instruction and use of data for assessment to drive instructional strategies based on the standards. 4. Observation/Evaluation/Classroom Visits to be used with immediate feedback and/or pre/post conferences with teacher to ensure instructional rigor and relevance is evident and effective |
| Person Responsible | Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #2 | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Title | Parent Engagement |
| Rationale | Parent engagement in their child's education is valuable and has an impact on the success of their student. Increasing parent knowledge and availability of resources to help their child will increase parental awareness of standards and what is expected of their child academically and behaviorally. Building relationships with parents will in turn increase student outcomes. |
| Intended Outcome | If parent engagement opportunities are provided more frequently then parents can assist in providing academic supports resulting in learning gains. |
| Point Person | Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parent Engagement activities will be planned according to grade level needs based on student data. Examples of parent engagement activities are but not limited to: Strong Fathers, Math & Science Night, Literacy Night, and Special Areas (Art, Music, and Physical Education). 2. Parent conferences led by student with teacher support scheduled throughout the year. 3. Open invitation to School Advisory Committee will result in an increase in parent awareness of standards being taught and school based decision making with parent input. 4. Monthly school based as well as weekly teacher newsletters distributed to parents to bring awareness to standards and resources available to parents. 5. ESOL translators available at parent engagement events. |
| Person Responsible | Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parent surveys targeted for Parent Engagement Activities and results utilized for future planning of engagement activities or specific needs of individual families. 2. School Advisory Council attendance sheets and input from parents noted in minutes to address needs of school. 3. Engagement attendance sheets utilized in order to determine if time/day maximize parent attendance throughout the school year. |
| Person Responsible | Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us) |

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.

Stanton-Weirsdale is a Title I school. The parent engagement plan is available for viewing at the following website:

Parent engagement trainings will be planned and executed by Marie-Elena Curty, Literacy Content Area

Specialist and Georgiana Carson, Math Content Area Specialist, and administration. Both coaches are Title I funded.

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.

Social and emotional needs are met on an individual basis as needed with the School Counselor. Furthermore, a mentoring program for at risk students pairs up educators and a student for support and encouragement. Problem-Solving meetings are scheduled as needed with the school support team, which includes the Guidance Counselor, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist, Teacher, and other members as needed. This team may review a child's social-emotional needs of the student as well as academic needs.

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

Stagger Start is a district initiative to assist kindergarten students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Small groups of Kindergarten students attend school for the first two days, giving staff the opportunity to administer assessments, to develop one-on-one relationship with students and to eliminate anxiety is the primary focus of Stagger Start. FLKRS/Star Early Literacy Assessment are tools used to determine readiness needs. Florida's Voluntary PreK program is currently implemented throughout the district to assist preschoolers with early literacy skills. Ongoing communication is provided to parents regarding these programs. Federal and state funding is used to provide programs for our preschool children. Information is provided for the VPK program and pre-registration of kindergarteners by the guidance office.

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 MTSS Leadership Team functions through the following problem-solving process:

Step 1: Problem Recognition – The Instructional Leadership team will identify and define the target problem

Step 2: Problem Analysis – attempt to determine why the problem is occurring through data analysis and other input

Step 3: Intervention Design – determine best approach to solve the problem

Step 4: Implementation of Intervention – design tactics to resolve problem

Step 5: Response to Intervention – Monitor progress and determine effectiveness

Title I Part A -Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation through after-school tutoring programs. Title I – Part C – Migrant Program: N/A

Title I –Part D- Neglected and Delinquent N/A

Title II – Part A: - District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.

Title III – Part A: Services are provided through the District, for education materials and ELL district support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X - District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (Clothing, school supplies, social services referrals....) for students identified homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - N/A

Exceptional Student Education - The Florida Diagnostic Learning Resource System is funded through EHA-Part B as amended by PL94-142, to provide Support Services to Exceptional Student Education Programs.

Health Department - District and schools coordinate with the Health Department for Absences Programs, Asthma Programs and Nurses that oversee school health clinics.

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program - State funded Pre-K program offered at select school sites during the school year and summer.

Classroom teacher's duty is to assign intervention and monitor it. All other team members duties are to support the classroom teacher in providing interventions and support.

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

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers, and life.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$246,382.00