

Duval County Public Schools

# Oceanway Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

<http://www.duvalschools.org/oceanway>

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Gray**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: D (33%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

<http://www.duvalschools.org/oceanway>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	86%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	C

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval 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.**

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

### 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
Hinkley, Michelle	Principal	
Johnson, Keith	Instructional Coach	
Heath, Brandi	Instructional Coach	
Ehrenberg , Julie	Assistant Principal	
Travis, Amanda	Other	Reading Interventionist

### 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	101	101	85	102	106	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	6	6	11	7	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	3	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

**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	4	20	28	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

**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	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

38

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/16/2019

**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	31	20	24	17	20	29	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	1	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	16	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

**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	12	27	33	30	24	44	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

**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	56%	50%	57%	54%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	47%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	63%	62%	61%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	51%	46%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	48%	53%	47%	50%	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	101 (0)	101 (0)	85 (0)	102 (0)	106 (0)	101 (0)	596 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 ( )	6 ( )	11 ( )	7 ( )	10 ( )	8 ( )	48 (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)	3 (0)	9 (0)	18 (0)	30 (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	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	24	42	30	45	46	23	14				
BLK	54	59	54	68	55	31	38				
HSP	65	62		78	77						
WHT	54	61	57	71	68	42	55				
FRL	50	62	59	69	64	47	55				

  

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	24	35	38	45	46	30	20				
BLK	52	50		67	60		44				
HSP	50	40		60							
MUL	53	54		67	69						
WHT	56	56	40	68	60	36	59				
FRL	52	54	43	66	62	44	48				

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	22	39	37	35	45	47	22				
BLK	64	69		65	66	45	47				
HSP	53	62		69	69						
MUL	63	69		81	77						
WHT	51	51	40	63	57	44	49				
FRL	47	57	43	62	57	46	49				

**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	57
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 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	51
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	
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	58
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.**

SWD sub-group shows the lowest performance. This sub-group has significant academic deficiencies and many are working multiple grade levels below their current grade level.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline for the 2018-2019 school year. Our fifth grade students in 2018-2019 were 4% lower in reading proficiency than our fifth grade students from the previous year.

**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.**

Our greatest gap was in math LPQ. Oceanway Elementary was at 38% and the state was at 51%. Our math LPQ has been below the state average for multiple years. This is an area of increased focus and we will be implementing a new program (Acaletics) as well as tracking student data monthly in order to assess effectiveness of instruction and curriculum. Many of our students have significant gaps in their learning and while they are making incremental growth it is not enough to show gains on a grade level assessment.

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

At Oceanway Elementary, our ELA LPQ showed the largest growth with an increase of 17 points from 2018 to 2019. Our school had a priority focus on these students and we were very intentional with our actions last year. All of our ELA LPQ students received intervention in either Phonics for Reading or LLI based on individual need.

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

Reflecting on our EWS data, our SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup (41%) and our Economically Disadvantaged subgroups (58%) are both potential areas of concern.

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

1. Increase in proficiency in SWD sub-group
2. Increase in learning gains in Math
3. Increase in LPQ gains in Math
4. Increase in Science proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Lowest Performing Quartile
<b>Rationale</b>	Math LPQ did not show substantial growth. (+1) Math Learning Gains only showed slight growth. (+5)
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase Math LPQ growth by at least 10 points. Increase overall math gains by at least 10 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If all classrooms implement targeted grade level instruction (Acaletics) in addition to daily differentiated instruction for identified students then we will see growth in learning gains and bottom quartile gains resulting in academic achievement.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Acaletics (Math) has been recognized by FLDOE and across the nation as a research-based, results-based supplemental program designed to boost student performance and achievement results.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Provide PD for leadership team and teachers on Acaletics and program implementation. 2. Work with teachers to implement the program in all math classrooms (K-5). 3. Provide tutoring for students as appropriate based on data. 4. Monitor data to assess the success of the program.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Keith Johnson (johnsonk4@duvalschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	Science proficiency dropped (-6).
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase science proficiency (5th grade) at least 10 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide targeted, aligned, data-driven instruction for students including hand-on opportunities (including field trips) to create further exposure to science content and vocabulary.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If all classrooms implement targeted, data-driven science instruction to include opportunities for hands-on instruction then we will see growth in proficiency resulting in increased academic achievement.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide science-related field trips for students related to grade-level content (Including but not limited to STARBASE and Marine Science Center).</li> <li>2. Utilize the PITSCO lab for 3rd-5th grade classes as appropriate to provide hands-on learning opportunities in science.</li> <li>3. Utilize the STEM lab for K-5th grade classes as appropriate to provide hands-on learning opportunities in science.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Reading Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	Reading proficiency has not increased significantly over the past 3 years (+2). Science proficiency dropped (-5).
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase reading proficiency at least 5 points. Increase science proficiency at least 10 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If all classrooms implement targeted, intentional interventions (LLI) (through classroom teacher or tutor) in addition to daily differentiated instruction for identified students then we will see growth in students reaching proficiency as they move toward grade level instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students need targeted instruction in their specific areas of deficiency and at their instructional and independent reading level in order to show growth.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement LLI in all classrooms (K-5) as appropriate with groups of students.</li> <li>2. Provide PD as needed for teachers to assist with implementation.</li> <li>3. Implement coaching cycles with teachers or groups of teachers as needed to assist with delivery of instruction.</li> <li>4. Provide in-school tutoring to allow for additional groups to receive LLI instruction.</li> <li>5. Monitor the use of resources to ensure enter activities are appropriate and differentiated.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Julie Ehrenberg (guernonj@duvalschools.org)

**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.**



It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through certain events such as Family Movie Nights, Family Dances, Math Night, Literacy Night, Student Conference night etc.. These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners as well as our faith-based partners.

### **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.**

Administration meets with the guidance counselor quarterly to review discipline referrals and the personal development section of report cards for each teacher to determine those students needing further assistance. Our school also utilizes Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum. Sanford Harmony is a skills promotion program that uses free-standing lessons to promote social and emotional learning for students in PreK through sixth grade.

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

Each year we host Kindergarten Round-up. Notification for the Round-up is made via flyers, the monthly newsletter, our school website and marquee. We work with Oceanway Middle School, our feeder school for middle school to give our fifth graders an orientation to their new school. Our fifth grade students take a field trip to the school. This gives them an opportunity to see what the school looks like as well as gives them an opportunity to ask questions. Our administration, guidance counselor, and office staff communicates with parents and shares any concerns or questions that they may have during their time of transition.

### **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.**

Administration reviews budgets and expenditures as well as student and teacher data to ensure that the school is adequately staffed in order to meet the academic needs of the students. The data is reviewed and available funds are used to provide supplemental staff for small group instruction, using evidenced-based interventions. The funding sources are coordinated to maximize the number of students and the amount of services available for the interventions. Data is reviewed quarterly to insure that the interventions that have been put in place are helping.

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

Each year, the school engages community members, business partners and other community stakeholders in our annual Career Day. Members of various business services visit each classroom to discuss experience and education level needed for their chosen careers. This event gives students opportunities to learn about the many different career opportunities and the experience needed for their chosen career.