

St. Johns County School District

Alice B. Landrum Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Guy Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 6/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (82%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Alice B. Landrum Middle School

230 LANDRUM LN, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

www.lms.stjohns.k12.fl.us

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	6%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

The mission of Alice B. Landrum Middle School is to prepare students for secondary study while developing learners' critical thinking abilities, encouraging student-centered learning, enhancing their interpersonal relationships and enriching their overall educational experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alice B. Landrum Middle School will create an environment that fosters students of high character and individual academic excellence through authentic experiences.

The 4 C's: Caring, Collaboration, Communication and Critical Thinking

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
Player, Ryan	Principal	Facilitates admin team, Building Leadership Team, manages facility, sets mission and vision, sets goals and expectations for progress monitoring, oversees roles and responsibilities of MTSS team, and ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
White, Liza	School Counselor	Bring student's to team attention, provide grade, course and attendance information, gather teacher feedback on student behavior, track academic performance, monitor parent contact and facilitate meetings with parents and teachers.
	Assistant Principal	LEA, Schoology, Facilities, MTSS team member
OConnell, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Testing, Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development, MTSS member
Curran, Bonnie	Instructional Coach	Facilitates RTI process, MTSS team, progress monitoring, provides Tier 1 student data
Wood, Amanda	Psychologist	Identifies need for resources and provides student and guidance support.
Dean, Crystal	School Counselor	Bring student's to team attention, provide grade, course and attendance information, gather teacher feedback on student behavior, track academic performance, monitor parent contact and facilitate meetings with parents and teachers.
Dobbins, Stacey	School Counselor	Bring student's to team attention, provide grade, course and attendance information, gather teacher feedback on student behavior, track academic performance, monitor parent contact and facilitate meetings with parents and teachers.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	332	506	0	0	0	0	1177	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	46	0	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	20	0	0	0	0	38	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	21	0	0	0	0	54	

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	0	0	0	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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)

61

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/27/2019

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	47	42	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	29	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	36	0	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	47	42	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	29	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	36	0	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	6	10	19	0	0	0	0	35	

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	83%	68%	54%	85%	69%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	59%	54%	68%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	47%	60%	50%	44%
Math Achievement	93%	77%	58%	91%	76%	56%
Math Learning Gains	84%	68%	57%	82%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%	60%	51%	76%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	82%	70%	51%	87%	69%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	72%	97%	87%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	339 (0)	332 (0)	506 (0)	1177 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (19)	23 (47)	46 (42)	76 (108)
One or more suspensions	0 (4)	18 (16)	20 (29)	38 (49)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	3 (7)	7 (12)	10 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18 (14)	15 (20)	21 (36)	54 (70)

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
06	2019	85%	74%	11%	54%	31%
	2018	82%	71%	11%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	70%	7%	51%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	79%	71%	8%	56%	23%
	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	88%	74%	14%	55%	33%
	2018	87%	73%	14%	52%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	95%	80%	15%	54%	41%
	2018	88%	80%	8%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	94%	78%	16%	46%	48%
	2018	94%	73%	21%	45%	49%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	82%	72%	10%	48%	34%
	2018	83%	75%	8%	50%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	87%	-87%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	90%	8%	71%	27%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	94%	89%	5%	71%	23%
Compare		4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	43	54	47	61	66	64	31	85	16		
ELL		60			70						
ASN	87	78		98	95		100	100	87		
BLK	63	43		81	86						
HSP	78	60	57	88	74	66	72	95	50		
MUL	91	72		90	88			92			
WHT	83	67	61	94	84	83	83	98	53		
FRL	54	51	41	81	73	65	59	87	13		
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	41	50	49	61	63	67	28	67	6		
ASN	91	67		93	83		71	100	87		
BLK	67	67		72	67						
HSP	81	62	67	88	74	65	82	89	47		
MUL	95	80		100	80						
WHT	82	62	54	91	79	74	85	94	48		

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
FRL	62	55	41	82	75	71	65	76	27		
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	41	39	33	57	68	65	63	84	25		
ASN	93	78		93	83		100	93	75		
BLK	91			91							
HSP	85	71	71	87	81	71	88	91	45		
MUL	79	57		86	86						
WHT	84	68	59	91	82	78	86	97	56		
FRL	62	51	36	78	73	73	77	86	38		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
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	87
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	78
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	58
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 showing the lowest performance is ELA Lowest Quartile with 60% of those students making Learning Gains. While this data component continues to be an area of low performance and focus, students making gains in our lowest quartile improved by 5% compared to previous year. The improvement on learning gains is credited to school wide goals and focus in PLCs on students who were identified as lowest quartile.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was in Science where the district average decreased as well. The 8th grade Science score decreased from 84% to 82%. Decline could be indicative of misaligned curriculum and standards review.

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.

The greatest gap between school data and state average is in Math with 93% proficient at Landrum where the state average is 58%. The 35 point difference is evidence of our students excelling in math from 6th grade through the Algebra and Geometry EOCs. Students are placed in appropriate level course and the curriculum and pace is rigorous.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is the 9% growth in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. This is a result of school wide data chats, goal setting, and progress monitoring for LQ students.

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

Area of concern regarding EWS data are the 10 8th graders with two or more indicators. These students will be tracked by Guidance.

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

1. Improve ELA learning Gains by 5%
2. Improve Math Learning Gains by 5%
3. Improve LQ ELA & Math by 5%
4. Improve Science by 5%
5. Improve Civics by 1%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academic Growth
Rationale	Data indicates a need to continue to focus on learning gains for the lowest quartile and growth for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>71% in ELA Learning Gains (up from 66%)</p> <p>89% in Math Learning Gains (up from 84%)</p> <p>65% in ELA Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile (up from 60%)</p> <p>87% in Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile (up from 82%)</p> <p>98% in Civics (up from 97%)</p> <p>87% in Science (up from 82%)</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based progress tracking by course and data chats focused on growth and goal setting with level 1s and 2s. Use of student focused progress monitoring data to remediate and focus on standard based instruction for student growth is the focus of our PLCs and administration. Level 1s and 2s will be tracked by our ILC, through ESE, admin lead data chats and will be provided ongoing academic support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School performance data indicates that having a specific plan for our students in the lowest quartile will continue to be successful as growth from previous year supports this conclusion. Data also indicates that continued support of our PLC process in Science, Civics, Math and ELA will lead to sustained trends in growth and a continued emphasis on standards based instruction and remediation in a student centered classroom.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review student, grade level and school wide data to determine areas of focus and opportunities for growth 2. Communicate school goals and expectations to PLC collaborative teams and support members 3. Identify resources and progress monitoring tools for ongoing tracking and goal setting for individual students 4. School leadership team will conduct data chats quarterly with level 1 & 2 students and allocate resources to address student needs and goals 5. School leadership will monitor and support the PLC process and will communicate cross curricular trends and areas of growth and opportunity for growth
Person Responsible	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	School Culture
Rationale	To establish a student centered environment that supports the cohesive unit of staff, students and community in the profile of a Landrum Lion.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased opportunities for students to receive positive recognition on a daily, weekly, and quarterly basis. Up to 270 students a week will be attending the Lions Den for lunch as a PBIS reward. Students will be recognized quarterly for academic achievements in luncheon with Principal. Staff are recognized daily for student centered environments through shout outs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	In creating the Profile of a Landrum Lion the faculty collaborated on identifying characteristics and traits for successful students and students participated in a school wide write to define what they needed to leave middle school prepared for high school and beyond. These collaborative efforts were used to create the profile of a student who is confident in academics, sophisticated in learning, accomplished in 21st century skills, and global in orientation. Students are then recognized and rewarded for displaying the traits of a Landrum Lion.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Incentivized performance leads to increased growth and opportunities to recognize and reward. Students responded positively to expansion of PBIS program last year and in response we have added the Lions Den with gaming, activity tables, bean bag chairs, putting green, giant connect four, and other board games.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify desirable skills and characteristics to create a Profile of a Landrum Lion through staff and student activities and collaborations. Communicate the Profile to all staff and students. 2. Determine criteria, means and opportunities for recognizing and rewarding students who demonstrate the characteristics of a Landrum Lion. 3. Establish the Lions Den and allow for up to 270 students to attend lunch in the Lions Den weekly 4. Plan and invite honor roll students to luncheon with principal quarterly 5. Recognize staff daily via email shout outs and students daily through Words of a Lion announcements
Person Responsible	Ryan Player (ryan.player@stjohns.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).

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.

n/a

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.

n/a

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

n/a

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.

n/a

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

n/a

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academic Growth	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Culture	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00