

Volusia County Schools

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/mcinnis/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Widalis Camacho

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Louise S. Mcinnis Elementary School

5175 US HIGHWAY 17, De Leon Springs, FL 32130

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/mcinnis/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

McInnis staff, students, and community work together to encourage life long learning in order to achieve our goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McInnis Elementary ensures academic excellence by motivating students through diverse learning experiences and celebrating individual successes.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bertolami, Lisa	Instructional Technology	Media Specialist, DLTL, PST Chair
Albright, Marci	Teacher, K-12	PE teacher
Campbell, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	third grade teacher
Gill, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Academic intervention teacher, testing coordinator
Koplas, Lynette	Teacher, K-12	third grade teacher
Lavallee, Sharon	Principal	Principal of the school
Mackey, Heather	Teacher, K-12	fifth grade teacher
McFall-Conte, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Asst. Principal of school
Larrabee, Sonia	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
Smith, Wayne	Teacher, ESE	ESE support facilitation teacher

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	69	65	46	63	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	3	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	2	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - Updated
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	9	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	56%	57%	35%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	53%	66%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	59%	63%	53%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	56%	62%	73%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	43%	51%	79%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	57%	53%	60%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	60 (0)	69 (0)	65 (0)	46 (0)	63 (0)	53 (0)	356 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	7 ()	3 ()	7 ()	5 ()	4 ()	31 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	19 (0)	25 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	54%	-3%	58%	-7%
	2018	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	56%	-18%	53%	-15%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	2	39	55	22	37	32	5				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	36	62	55	46	54	35	33				
HSP	39	60	52	50	49	30	38				
WHT	45	67		57	56		45				
FRL	37	58	48	48	49	33	39				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	5	30	44	24	52	53					
ELL	30	41	42	49	63	70	33				
HSP	38	44	39	58	69	65	44				
WHT	56	48		70	56		85				
FRL	43	46	45	60	67	62	50				
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	4	47	67	21	58	71	50				
ELL	19	44	67	46	64	75	39				
HSP	28	47	59	51	71	76	54				
WHT	52	61		61	77		72				
FRL	32	50	64	51	71	79	55				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in the gains in math for our lowest quartile. In 2018, 65% of lowest quartile students showed learning gains in math. In 2019, the percentage of lowest quartile students showing learning gains in math decreased to 32%. This was a decrease of 33 percentage points. One of the contributing factors was a lack of math intervention.

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

The data component that showed the largest decline from 2018 was the learning gains of our lowest quartile students in math. A main factor that contributed to the decline was the lack of math intervention.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

McInnis had many areas that had large gaps when compared to the state average. First was the learning gains of lowest quartile students in math. The state percentage was at 51%. McInnis was at 33%. Second was the overall achievement in ELA. The state average was 57% of students scoring a level 3 or above. McInnis' had 40% of students achieve a level 3 or above on the ELA assessment. In science, the state average was 53% of students achieving a level 3 or above. At McInnis, 38% of students scored a level 3 or above. The last area where McInnis had a large gap in comparison to the state, was math achievement. The state had 63% of students score a level 3 or above. At McInnis 51% of students scored a level 3 or above. Declines can be attributed to not teaching to the curriculum map/modules, lack of math intervention, and lack of achievement of our students with disabilities.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was learning gains in ELA. In 2018, 47% of the students showed gains in ELA. In 2019, that number increased to 60% of students showing

learning gains. For the 2018-2019 school year, McInnis was heavily focused on reading intervention. The ELA learning gains can be attributed to the intensive focus on reading intervention.

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

When looking at the EWS, one of the biggest areas of concern was that the number of students in course failure in reading/math (1 in 3rd grade, 3 in 4th grade, and 5 in 5th grade), does not correspond to the number of level 1's in reading and math (6 in 3rd grade, 19 in 4th grade, and 12 in 5th grade). After reflecting on these numbers, the conclusion was reached, especially among, general education students, the grades were inflated, and not in line with what a student was expected to earn on the FSA assessment.

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

1. Math Achievement
2. Science Achievement
3. Achievement of students with disabilities
4. learning gains of lowest quartile
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Improve achievement of Students with Disabilities
Rationale	According to the ESSA report, just 2% of students achieved a level 3 or above in the FSA ELA assessment. Overall, our ESSA percentage was 29%, 12% below the level of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase those scoring a level 3 or above from 2% of students to 7% of students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing rigor and expectations of students with disabilities through standards aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The effect size of small group instruction is a 0.79, which is almost two years growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. increase level of and amount of support through small groups 2. support from ESE teachers during weekly PLC's 3. Support in planning for instruction during PLC's including ESE staff 4. District ESE learning walks, in addition to school based learning walks. 5. data chats 6. Math, Science, ELA ERPL's that have a component focused on SWD's 7. Additional technology based intervention before school
Person Responsible	Sharon Lavalley (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase science achievement
Rationale	McInnis achievement in science decreased from 52% of students scoring a level 3 or above to just 38% of students scoring a level 3 or above.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase level of science achievement from 38% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sonia Larrabee (slarrabe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Instructing/Assessing at expected level of rigor through standards based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction carries an effect size of 0.79, which is almost 2 years growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. standards science day 2. science text through tutoring 3. science through special area 4. teacher run science lab/hands on activities 5. science district led learning walks 6. data chats 7. School based science ERPL 8. school based science learning walk 9. coaching cycles with identified teachers by academic coach 10. Academic coach supporting science planning through PLC's
Person Responsible	Sonia Larrabee (slarrabe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase learning gains of Lowest 25% of math students
Rationale	The learning gains of McInnis' lowest 25% of students decreased from 65% of students to 32% of students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase achievement of lowest quartile from 32% to 42%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sonia Larrabee (slarrabe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Instructing/Assessing at expected level of rigor through standards aligned instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The effect size of small group instruction is 0.79, which is almost 2 years growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of standard mathematical vocabulary through use of coaching cycles 2. All faculty trained and implementing use of number talks 3. math intervention serviced by intervention teachers 4. afternoon tutoring 5. District led math learning walks 6. data chats 7. School Based math ERPL 8. Support by academic coach with planning during PLC's 9. school based math learning walks 10. Additional technology based intervention before school
Person Responsible	Sonia Larrabee (slarrabe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

While, ELA achievement, and learning gains are not included as an area of focus, McInnis will continue to follow through with intensive reading intervention services based on iReady scores. Another school wide priority, that affects achievement, but isn't an area of focus, is social emotional learning. Our guidance counselor is developing SEL lessons for small groups of students as well as whole class lessons.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Meet the teacher, open house, during and after school activities, and parent student surveys are all components in establishing and maintaining positive relationships between teachers, students, families, and community members.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school counselor provides guidance and counseling to individual students in need or when requested by parents/guardians, or teachers. The school counselor also provides strategies and training to support teachers, parents and students. A school psychologist is available to provide assistance to staff and students.

Classroom lessons on bullying, friendship, cooperation, and other topics related to building a positive, social-emotional environment, are provided to students by the school counselor or teachers. Specific staff members are trained annually on Non Violent Crisis Intervention strategies in order to help deescalate students in high or dangerous emotional states.

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

The district, in partnership with the local Head Start Agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK sites and other local facilities, coordinates efforts to promote a continuous stream of services, and effective transition for the children and families. These may include:

Providing an opportunity for ongoing communication for coordination of programs, and shared expectations of children's learning as they transition to elementary school

Collaborate on professional development including transition related training for school and preschool staff when available.

Utilize preschool assessments to monitor readiness skills for students transitioning from preschool to kindergarten.

Conduct kindergarten registration and orientation. Provide local public policies to preschool agencies, and other relevant information to transition the children and their families

fifth grade teachers have articulation meetings with the local middle school faculty and staff

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.

McInnis has Professional learning Communities which meet weekly to analyze data and plan for instruction based on student needs. The PLC teams identify interventions for implementation that will provide individualized instruction for students who do not respond to core instruction.

The problem solving team meets regularly to monitor individual student needs and suggest new interventions as needed. The team follows up with individual teachers on the effectiveness of the intervention and shares with parents information about the PST meetings.

Programs Supported by Title I, at McInnis, are:

Academic coach for the purpose of comprehensive staff development

Academic intervention teachers (reading and math) to provide intervention for targeted students

Supplemental tutoring after school

Supplemental funds for staff development determined by the results of district and school based data.

The district Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) provides the following programs for McInnis

students:

Academic assistance through tutoring and summer school, translation services for parent/teacher conferences, parental support for parent/student activity nights, and food/medical assistance through referrals to outside agencies. Through Title III, ESOL teachers are provided with ongoing support and professional development to make sure best practices are being implemented. ESOL teachers are consistently monitoring the progress of ELL students to identify specific needs. McInnis works closely with the Title X coordinator to make sure homeless students have the materials and resources they need to be successful.

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

McInnis Elementary builds, and sustains, partnerships through regular communication with the DeLeon Springs Community Association. DeLeon Springs Community Association support McInnis through the Riding to Read Program, International Walk to School Day, and through their yearly art festivals. Food Brings Hope provides identified families with weekly food bags. Also, Food Brings Hope provides funds for school programs.

Administration and teachers partner with local colleges and universities such as Stetson, and Daytona State to provide internships for teachers.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve achievement of Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase science achievement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase learning gains of Lowest 25% of math students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00