

Marion County Public Schools

Wyomina Park 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 |

Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[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 | 67% |

School Grades History

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

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.

To
Learn and lead by
Empowering all stakeholders to
Access the skills required to fully
Develop as successful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learn and lead to succeed.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Baxley, Joy | Principal |
| Hughes, Jolene | Administrative Support |
| Cino, Michelle | Assistant Principal |
| Howell, Margaret | Instructional Coach |
| Mesnick, Cassandra | School Counselor |
| Sanford, Troy | Assistant Principal |
| Tucker, Stefannie | Instructional Coach |
| Macias, Lisa | Dean |
| Hickman, Michael | Dean |

Duties

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

Joy Baxley, Principal - provides leadership, input and overall guidance to the group.
Michelle Cino and Troy Sanford, Assistant Principals - provide overall input (academic and behavioral) and ensure the meeting is streamlined. Ensure the PMP is being adhered to, followed and monitored.
Cassandra Mesnick, Guidance Counselor – Parent Liaison regarding status of PMP, testing, etc. Facilitates the meeting with the Principal or Assistant Principals. Also offers insight towards emotional well-being of students.
Lisa Macias and Michael Hickman, Deans – facilitate behavior PMPs and SATs, offer insight to child behaviors, recommend behavioral interventions; monitor programs in place for behavior cases.
Gina Gazzaniga, ESE Specialist – reports test results and offers behavioral interventions, monitors all things ESE
Classroom teachers – write the PMPs, meets with the Assistant Principal & Principal, provides interventions, reports intervention progress.
Stephannie Tucker, Instructional Coach- Provides input on instructional strategies, engagement and

coaches teachers. Marty Howell, Instructional Coach - Provides input on instructional strategies, engagement and coaches teachers.

Administrative team meets weekly to address Tier 1 issues, and monthly to address Tier 2 and 3 issues, in the areas of academics, behavior, attendance and mental health.

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 | 26 | 23 | 12 | 22 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| One or more suspensions | 13 | 15 | 12 | 32 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 42 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |

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 | 22 | 27 | 30 | 44 | 31 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

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 | 7 | 24 | 16 | 25 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Mobility | 0 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Retention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 7 | 24 | 16 | 25 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Mobility | 0 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Retention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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?

Math bottom quartile learning gains and ELA Proficiency were both the lowest at 34%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Only Science showed a decline, and it was 3 points, from 39% to 36%.

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

ELA and Math proficiency are furthest from the state average scores.

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

ELA learning gains increased 25 points, from 29% to 54%. It is not a trend.

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

We focused on collaborative planning with each grade level twice each week for ELA and Math, We did iReady with fidelity and used district approved reading interventions for students on Tier 2 and Tier 3.

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 | 34% | 46% | 56% | 35% | 47% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 44% | 55% | 52% | 49% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 37% | 48% | 41% | 47% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 40% | 49% | 62% | 31% | 48% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 50% | 46% | 59% | 43% | 47% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | 35% | 47% | 32% | 40% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 36% | 51% | 55% | 40% | 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 | 26 (7) | 23 (24) | 12 (16) | 22 (25) | 16 (19) | 11 (13) | 110 (104) |
| One or more suspensions | 13 (0) | 15 (12) | 12 (14) | 32 (13) | 13 (11) | 14 (11) | 99 (61) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 (0) | 2 (10) | 13 (2) | 3 (10) | 0 (35) | 1 (25) | 22 (82) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 48 (21) | 42 (0) | 48 (1) | 138 (22) |

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 | 36% | 46% | -10% | 57% | -21% |
| | 2017 | 33% | 50% | -17% | 58% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 30% | 43% | -13% | 56% | -26% |
| | 2017 | 27% | 52% | -25% | 56% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 35% | 46% | -11% | 55% | -20% |
| | 2017 | 28% | 47% | -19% | 53% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 46% | 48% | -2% | 62% | -16% |
| | 2017 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 62% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 33% | 47% | -14% | 62% | -29% |
| | 2017 | 24% | 55% | -31% | 64% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 40% | 50% | -10% | 61% | -21% |
| | 2017 | 27% | 45% | -18% | 57% | -30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 38% | 49% | -11% | 55% | -17% |
| | 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 | 14 | 43 | 33 | 23 | 29 | 9 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 50 | | 6 | 40 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 46 | 56 | 30 | 42 | 24 | 12 | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 49 | 36 | 34 | 56 | 36 | 39 | | | | |
| MUL | 17 | 50 | | 11 | 14 | | 20 | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 67 | | 58 | 63 | | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 50 | 47 | 36 | 48 | 35 | 32 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 14 | | 21 | 33 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 20 | 18 | 11 | 25 | 27 | | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 30 | 30 | 12 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 24 | 17 | 24 | 33 | 38 | 40 | | | | |
| MUL | 29 | 14 | | 25 | 31 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 41 | | 42 | 45 | | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 27 | 21 | 24 | 35 | 37 | 28 | | | | |

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

Rationale After reviewing multiple sources of data, it was determined that students were not being taught to the depth of the standards or being kept fully engaged in the learning process through rigorous and relevant activities and lessons.

Intended Outcome If we support teachers in collaboratively planning to select and deliver rigorous, standards based lessons and activities, and provide training on, model and practice student engagement strategies, then student achievement will increase. Our goal for student outcome is to increase 4th grade learning gains in ELA and Math by 5%, increase 5th grade Science by 4 %, and increase ELA proficiency by 3% and Math proficiency by 5%. We also want to increase the learning gains for the bottom quartile in 4th grade math by 10%.

Point Person Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Schedule weekly collaborative planning for grades K-5 in ELA and Math, with attending AP's and Instructional coach for the grade level providing guidance in the process of selecting appropriate resources and planning engaging lessons. We will also schedule Learning Walks at our school and neighboring schools to showcase classrooms with exemplary lessons, activities and student engagement.

Person Responsible Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Monitor lesson plans, uploaded collaborative planning sheets, resource selection checklists, MCIES and Walkthrough data for compliance and implementation. We will monitor progress towards growth targets and stretch growth targets in iReady for ELA and Math, as well as check district assessments for standards mastery.

Person Responsible Troy Sanford (troy.sanford@marion.k12.fl.us)

| Activity #2 | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Title | PROCESS-PARENT FAMILY ENGAGEMENT |
| Rationale | Our data indicates that only 117 parents completed the parent survey last year. This provides us with only a limited needs assessment, Further needs assessment was done to determine the needs of those who are willing to attend a monthly parent group. |
| Intended Outcome | If we partner with parents in training and communicating about their child's education, and provide support activities and strategies to use at home, then parent engagement will increase, and student achievement will increase in turn. Increased family engagement will be measured by a 10% increase in the number of surveys returned. |
| Point Person | Cassandra Mesnick (cassandra.mesnick@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | We will host an FSA Night and a Science Fair night, to provide parents with information on test content and practice, as well as test taking strategies. We will also host 3 events through Strong Fathers, Strong Families, to provide dads and other father figures with activities to use at home to support the development of math and science skills. |
| Person Responsible | Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | We anticipate that increased involvement will contribute to an increase in the math and science test scores, and will also be reflected in positive survey results following those events. We will monitor growth in Math through iReady data, and science growth by analyzing science QSMAs. |
| Person Responsible | Troy Sanford (troy.sanford@marion.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #3 | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Title | CONTEXT-BEHAVIOR |
| Rationale | Our data indicates that 153 of our students had a total of 472 discipline referrals. When students are pulled for class to discuss the incidents, and a consequence is assigned, they are missing valuable class time for instruction. |
| Intended Outcome | If we implement Zones of Regulation with fidelity throughout the school, then discipline referrals will be reduced as we provide students with strategies to de-escalate themselves, and academic achievement will increase due to students being in the classroom more. We would like to see less than 125 students with discipline referrals, and a total number of referrals less than 450. |
| Point Person | Lisa Macias (lisa.macias@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Review last year's training and provide a refresher training for implementing ZONES of regulation. Posters will be provided for each class, and time on the morning show will be dedicated to reminders and practicing strategies. |
| Person Responsible | Lisa Macias (lisa.macias@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | We will continue to roll out and implement The Leader in Me Program, through a staff book study of The Leader in Me, 7 Habits of Highly Effective People training for all adults, and a Habit of the Month will be selected for featuring on the morning show, in newsletters, parent trainings and faculty meetings. The discipline pivot table will provide data on number of referrals, types of referrals, consequences, and areas of concern where we may need to implement more structure for student success. |
| Person Responsible | Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@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.

We will be hosting 3 events through Strong Fathers, Strong Families. We will also showcase our STEM projects and hold an FSA night to help parents with strategies to prepare their students for state testing. Our Safe Halloween event will build positive relationships, as will our Pastries with Parents event. We also offer a monthly Parent Group which addresses needs revealed through the most recent Parent Survey. Childcare is provided, as well as food appropriate to the occasion and time of training.

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.

The Leadership team reviews students who demonstrate a need for counseling and mentoring on a weekly basis. Students are placed into small counseling groups according to need. Some students require a check-in/check-out process throughout the day (for mentoring or a part of a specific behavior plan). Specific members of the staff are utilized for the check-in/check-out process based on the relationship they have with the student(s). At risk students participate in a mentoring program championed by the Guidance Counselor. Those students are chosen based on MTSS identification, Tier 2 or Tier 3, in academics and/or behavior. In addition, we rolled out a Zones of Regulation training last year, and purchased posters for each class and guide books for each teacher. This program will be implemented school wide this year.

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 students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Only one third of the class per day attend school the first three days, giving staff the opportunity to administer assessments, to develop one-on-one relationships with students and to eliminate anxiety is the primary focus of STAGGER START. FLKRS are tools used to determine readiness needs. Florida's Voluntary Pre-K, Headstart, and Hippy (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters) are programs currently implemented throughout the district to assist preschoolers with early literacy skills. The DRA, or Diagnostic Reading Assessment will also be used to determine which skills need strengthening. Ongoing communication is provided to parents regarding these programs. Federal and state funding is used to provide programs for our preschool children. As students transition to middle school, the middle school principal and guidance counselor visit our 5th graders to provide an orientation and share some things to expect so students will feel more comfortable about going to 6th grade. Our middle school also hosts a separate orientation for 6th graders on their campus.

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 core admin team meets weekly basis to discuss school-wide concerns and to develop a focus based on data for Tier 1 needs and discuss resource allocations; personnel and materials. After each school wide assessment, the team meets to discuss trends and possible actions needed. Data is shared with grade levels at collaborative planning meetings for ELA and Math each week. The assistant principals meet 3 times a year with each classroom teacher to monitor the intervention response of each student. Students are appropriately placed in necessary interventions based on data and to make further recommendations. The team may also be called to meet as situations arise regarding placement of new students and severe behavior issues. We also meet monthly to address the needs of students who are in need of or receiving Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for academic/behavior/emotional supports. Coaches provide targeted support for targeted teachers in need.

Dropout prevention and academic intervention are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical funds. Supplemental instruction strategies may include, but are not limited to modified curriculum, intensified reading instruction, after school instruction, tutoring, mentoring, class size reduction, and extended school year intensive skills development during summer school.

District receives funds for programs such as Red Ribbon Week and Bullying Prevention that support prevention of violence in and around the school and that prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco,

drugs and foster a safe, drug free learning environment that supports student achievement.

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

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

College and Career Readiness: 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. At Wyomina Park, we hold a Career Day for Kindergarten, as well as for students in grades 3-5.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$322,750.00