

St. Johns County School District

Palm Valley Academy



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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Palm Valley Academy

700 BOBCAT LN, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

<http://www-pva.stjohns.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Zach Strom

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	7%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Palm Valley Academy

700 BOBCAT LN, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

<http://www-pva.stjohns.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>0%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>18%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19
Grade	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.

At Palm Valley Academy we will:

Pursue Excellence

Value All

Achieve Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building Purposeful Leaders Where Everyone Shines Through Achievement

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
Richardson, Jessica	Principal	Instructional & Operational Leadership School Budget Parent & Community Communication Faculty & Support Staffing School Improvement Plan Oversight Safety and Threat Assessment Team Member
Chiodo, Drew	Assistant Principal	Master Scheduling (all grades, lunch, resource, PLC collaboration) EEE Compliance & Scheduling PBIS Core Team Middle School Testing
Strom, Zach	Assistant Principal	Facilities & Operations Emergency Operations Plan & Safety Drill Procedures Duty Schedules Drop-off, pick-up, & transition procedures Construction Management Safety Team Elementary Testing
Stewart, Caitlyn	Assistant Principal	Educational Plans (EPs) & 504s Drill Schedules Textbooks, curriculum & resources Student Locker & Laptop usage Threat Assessment Team
Slocum , D’Niessa	Assistant Principal	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Threat Assessment Team Testing Coordinator
Newbold, Anje	Instructional Coach	Professional Development Planning and Implementation Mentor/Mentee Cadre New Teacher Cadre Instructional Coaching and Classroom Support Intervention Support

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	192	184	196	186	179	195	186	0	0	0	0	0	0	1318
Attendance below 90 percent	12	4	6	3	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	3	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	5	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

150

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	84%	84%	61%	0%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	67%	59%	0%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	61%	54%	0%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	89%	88%	62%	0%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	72%	71%	59%	0%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	66%	52%	0%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	75%	77%	56%	0%	79%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	95%	78%	0%	95%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	192 (0)	184 (0)	196 (0)	186 (0)	179 (0)	195 (0)	186 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1318 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	45 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (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	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	77%	3%	58%	22%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		80%				
05	2019	83%	76%	7%	56%	27%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		83%				
06	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		84%				
07	2019	0%	72%	-72%	52%	-52%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	93%	82%	11%	62%	31%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		87%				
05	2019	80%	80%	0%	60%	20%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		80%				
06	2019	91%	74%	17%	55%	36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		91%				
07	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	73%	0%	53%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	0%	79%	-79%	61%	-61%
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	57	54	53	60	47	40	50				
ASN	92	88		100	90						
HSP	86	75		90	75		88				

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
MUL	87	77		97	86						
WHT	83	61	57	88	68	58	72				
FRL	57	59		75	61	50					
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
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

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	72
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	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
--	--

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	93
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	
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	83
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	70
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	60
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 lowest performance in a data component for Palm Valley Academy was in the Math Learning Gains of our lowest 25% of our students with disabilities, SWD. Only 40% of our SWD in our bottom quartile made a learning gain in the 2018-2019 school year.

Contributing factors include students that are two or more years below grade level and needing to close the achievement gap for these learners, while also maintaining grade level expectations.

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

Palm Valley Academy only has one year of data.

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.

We were above the state average in all areas.

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

For our first year as a school with a large student population new to Florida, we are proud of our achievements in 3rd grade math and 6th grade ELA and Math.

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

Our focus for this year will be on the 12 students who have been retained once and the 3 students who have been retained more than once. We will also intentionally focus on the 5 students with 2 or more early warning factors.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%, SWD
2. Math Lowest 25%, SWD
3. 5th Grade Science Achievement
4. EWS- 2 or more factors
5. Retainees- 1 year or more

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts Learning Gains Lowest 25% (SWD)
Rationale	Our most struggling students often require the most intensive interventions and it is the job of the school to ensure that all students are showing a year's worth of growth in all academic areas. Currently only 53% of the lowest quartile students showed a learning gain in English language arts. We would like to see this percentage increased while we continue to intentionally focus our attention on this specific sub group of students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Palm Valley Academy will raise the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 4%, from 53% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Richardson (jessica.richardson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research based practices and processes, MTSS, PLC process, Staff Deliberate Practice Plans
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS Core meetings will be utilized weekly to review school wide data and early warning systems. Tiered supports will be created for any student who is showing a significant gap from their peers and from grade level expectations. Weekly grade level PLC collaboration time will also allow grade level teachers to identify students for interventions and enrichment based on current data and current standards. Once students are identified by standard and level of need, teachers will meet with student sub groups to implement specially designed instruction to close learning gaps for students, while enriching within the standards for those students who are ready for this next step.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MTSS identification review of plans- fidelity checks 2. IEP review of current services and progress monitoring 3. Staff development surrounding EEE Deliberate Practice Plans 4. High Yield Instructional Strategies Observations and Feedback Practices, including Professional Development 5. Support for New Teachers
Person Responsible	Jessica Richardson (jessica.richardson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% (SWD)
Rationale	Our most struggling students often require the most intensive interventions and it is the job of the school to ensure that all students are showing a year's worth of growth in all academic areas. Currently 40% of the lowest quartile students showed a learning gain in Math. We would like to see this percentage increased while we continue to intentionally focus our attention on this specific sub group of students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Palm Valley Academy will raise the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 10%, from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Richardson (jessica.richardson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS, PLC, EEE Model
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS Core meetings will be utilized weekly to review school wide data and early warning systems. Tiered supports will be created for any student who is showing a significant gap from their peers and from grade level expectations. Weekly grade level PLC collaboration time will also allow grade level teachers to identify students for interventions and enrichment based on current data and current standards. Once students are identified by standard and level of need, teachers will meet with student sub groups to implement specially designed instruction to close learning gaps for students, while enriching within the standards for those students who are ready for this next step.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MTSS identification review of plans- fidelity checks 2. IEP review of current services and progress monitoring 3. Staff development surrounding EEE Deliberate Practice Plans 4. High Yield Instructional Strategies Observations and Feedback Practices, including Professional Development 5. Support for New Teachers
Person Responsible	Jessica Richardson (jessica.richardson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Character Counts
Rationale	At Palm Valley Academy we believe that you first must capture a child's heart before you can capture their minds.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>A mission/vision workshop was held in June of 2018 where all stakeholders where invited to take part in creating the mission statement and vision statement of Palm Valley Academy.</p> <p>A two day professional development workshop was attended by 50% of the Palm Valley Academy staff so that they could be trained in Capturing Kids Hearts in the summer of 2018 and again in the summer of 2019. This program, along with the St. Johns County Character Counts initiative, will create the foundation of social/emotional curriculum at Palm Valley Academy. The goal is to train the entire school staff in Capturing Kids Hearts over the next two years.</p> <p>All staff at Palm Valley Academy will be trained in PBIS policies and procedures, including our discipline matrix.</p> <p>Palm Valley Academy will implement Live School, a web based resource, to implement and monitor our Positive Behavior Support Structures.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our administrative team, to include our Dean of Students, will monitor the effectiveness of the above action steps. Our Dean of Students and Guidance Counselors will be the main points of contact for continued training and implementation of Capturing Kids Hearts, Character Counts, and Live School.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capturing Kids Heart Training 2. PBIS Core Team 3. Live School 4. Progress Monitoring of action steps 1-3 5. Data Collection on Discipline
Person Responsible	Drew Chiodo (drew.chiodo@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).

The additional areas of focus will be address through the continuous improvement process. School wide structures such as MTSS/Rtl, PLCs, and PBIS will allow constant dialogue to take place for all 5 priority areas.

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: English Language Arts Learning Gains Lowest 25% (SWD)	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% (SWD)	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Character Counts	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00