Matthew W. Gilbert Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Matthew W. Gilbert Middle School

1424 FRANKLIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/matthewgilbert

Demographics

Principal: LaTonya Parker

Start Date for this Principal: 1/20/2014

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	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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (32%) 2014-15: F (30%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

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.

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

Matthew W. Gilbert Middle School

1424 FRANKLIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/matthewgilbert

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

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

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.

Matthew Gilbert Middle School is committed to increasing academic excellence through high quality instruction in a culture that fosters accountability, ownership, and collaboration in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Matthew W. Gilbert Middle School students will exceed their academic goals, work collaboratively with one another, and grow as young leaders who take ownership of their growth and bettering their community.

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
Goodwin, Jamelle	Principal	
Fulginiti, Katharine	Assistant Principal	
Sutton, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	
Council, Latoya	Assistant Principal	
Jennings, Dante	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	382	142	192	0	0	0	0	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	64	0	0	0	0	117
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	77	122	0	0	0	0	382

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	109	0	0	0	0	191

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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	22	18	22	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	19	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	79	83	0	0	0	0	213

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	35	25	24	0	0	0	0	84

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	22	18	22	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	19	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	79	83	0	0	0	0	213

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	35	25	24	0	0	0	0	84

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	19%	43%	54%	14%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	36%	49%	54%	32%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	47%	45%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	36%	49%	58%	28%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	50%	57%	52%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	51%	47%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	17%	44%	51%	19%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	68%	72%	43%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	382 (0)	142 (0)	192 (0)	716 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (22)	44 (18)	64 (22)	108 (62)
One or more suspensions	0 (18)	53 (13)	64 (19)	117 (50)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (6)	12 (6)	2 (7)	14 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	183 (51)	77 (79)	122 (83)	382 (213)

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	22%	47%	-25%	54%	-32%
	2018	14%	44%	-30%	52%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	18%	44%	-26%	52%	-34%
	2018	15%	41%	-26%	51%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	18%	49%	-31%	56%	-38%
	2018	26%	51%	-25%	58%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
	2018	23%	42%	-19%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	47%	-11%	54%	-18%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	20%	32%	-12%	46%	-26%
	2018	23%	31%	-8%	45%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	17%	40%	-23%	48%	-31%
	2018	28%	44%	-16%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	62%	69%	-7%	71%	-9%	
2018	95%	84%	11%	71%	24%	
Compare		-33%				
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	77%	57%	20%	61%	16%	

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Compare		3%			
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	10	19	20	16	43	47	6	22			
BLK	18	37	33	35	47	43	18	56	74		
HSP	10			40	40						
MUL	27	36		50	64						
WHT	31	27		50	47						
FRL	17	35	34	34	46	42	17	57	73		
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	7	40	37	15	46	55	12				
BLK	16	34	40	32	47	49	24	85	71		
HSP	30			40							
MUL	27	40		40							
WHT	30	50		33	42						
FRL	18	34	39	33	48	48	26	87	74		
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	5	30	39	13	33	36	19	17			
BLK	13	32	46	29	51	46	15	42	54		
MUL	23	31		25	67						
WHT	20	18		32	65		40				
FRL	14	30	44	27	52	49	20	43	54		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 data component from 2018-2019 was Grade 8 Science. Data declined from 25% to 17% proficiency. Students testing data displayed that students who were not proficient tested lower in the Nature of Science category. Students within this past year's cohort, did not receive standards aligned instruction during the 7th grade year, due to teacher resignation and vacancy. Thus, the interpretation of information was not successful. Additionally, teacher absence within the 8th grade content was an impact on student learning.

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

The data component that displayed the greatest decline was Civics. In the year prior, 7th grade students proficient in Reading were scheduled into Civics. which was approximately 42 students, 95% of those student passed the state EOC. in the 2019 Spring session 8th grade students who were not

scheduled in 7th grade, took the course. Thus, 62% of 8th grade and 7th grade tested this year were proficient.

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 data component with the greatest gap, compared to the state, was Science. The state average for grade 8 Science Achievement was 51%, while the district average was 44%, as the school fell far below at `17%. The decline in data is based upon the lack of previous content knowledge that the 8th grade was able to demonstrate. Students missed a full year of Science instruction the previous year, due to teacher vacancy.

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

need to complete

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

need to complete

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

1. Increase Science Achievement for 8th grade
2. Increase Civics Achievement
3. Increase the achievement of students with disabilities
4. Decrease the students receiving discipline
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards Aligned Instruction in ALL content ares classes
Rationale	When teachers increase the effectiveness of standards-based Tier I instruction, and implement tasks that align to the Achievement level descriptors, providing equitable access to all standards; student growth and proficiency rates will increase.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student proficiency will increase by at least 3% on all grade levels, students will demonstrate one years' worth of growth or more, as measured by the state Learning Gains chart. This will be conclusive for Reading/ELA, Math. Science and Civics data will increase as students will be accustom to learning the objectives at the appropriate level, and demonstrate mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katharine Fulginiti (beattyk1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of weekly common planning sessions by content, led by administrators and/or academic coaches, to analyze standards at the Level 3 achievement level or higher, and plan effective tiered instruction that aligns with the demands of the standard. Additionally, teams will analyze and plan tasks that allow students to demonstrate understanding and standards mastery. Following the implementation of planned tasks, teachers and leadership will analyze student progress, in order to plan next steps and/or remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student success is measured by their ability to master the state standards. If teachers are delivering instruction at the level of the grade level standard, students will have more access and practice with the level of performance intended. Teachers do need specific guidance on how to utilize all resources that will improve planning, practice and instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Weekly common planning facilitated by administrator or coach 2. Develop standards aligned instructional calendars 3. Student work analysis protocol to determine student performance 4. Coaching observations for novice teachers to determine the effectiveness of the delivery 5. Teacher data conferences to determine the effectiveness of instruction, as it reflects in student assessment data.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Sutton (griffint1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase the culture and climate among students, parents and community
Rationale	When the school leaders ensure that students, staff, and parents are not only informed but have an active voice in their school community, they build a culture of inclusiveness, and eliminate feelings of distrust and hostility. Additionally, when a school's cultural focus away from punishment for non-compliance to a focus on recognizing and praising positive behaviors and successes, while including input from stakeholders, the culture transitions from operating under a deficit model. When schools embed social-emotional strategies into their learning environment, students and staff learn to be mindful of emotions, challenges, stresses, and traumas and make room for academic learning.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the amount of students receiving Class I and II referrals and OSS by 25%, and minimize the number of students with disabilities receiving disciplinary infractions through out the school year by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Latoya Council (rainesl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	With the support of a Behavior Interventionist, teachers will receive support ans strategies on working with students with disabilities, so that they do not become consistent classroom disruptions. The Behavior Interventionist will work closely with the school Dean of Climate and Culture to create student peer groups to assist students with positive decision making goals to eliminate negative behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Many effective behavioral interventions at the secondary level involve different reinforces, including peers. Another major shift between younger and older students is the number of environments that students take part in each day. To make the most appropriate adaptations, teachers should use student data to determine which ones are likely to have the greatest impact based on students' specific needs. The interventionist and Dean will be able to assist teachers in these determining factors.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify returning students with 5 or more disciplinary referrals from the previous year. 2. Conduct a restorative meeting with each student to create a positive goals plan for the school year 3. Identify a group of peer leaders to facilitate the restorative practice sessions 4. Monitor the students progress weekly and quarterly 5. provide quarterly awards to students who have met behavioral goals
Person Responsible	Dante Jennings (jenningsd@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).

N/A

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.

need to complete

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.

Before the beginning of the school year, rising 6th grade students are invited to attend a 6th grade bridge orientation that allows students to meet the staff, learn about Gilbert policies and procedures, and become accustomed to their new schedule and daily routine. They also learn about after school enrichment opportunities.

In the 4th quarter, 8th grade students are provided an opportunity to visit near by high schools to tour the building and see the programs offered first hand. During the 1st semester, the students are encouraged to participate in the annual 8th grade Parent night. Local high schools attend and bring presentations and showcase displays involving their programs. Students must also partake in an online assessment that develops a high school focus track.

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

The Academic Leadership Team collaborates with faculty members to analyze student data in an effort to identify content-related deficiencies. Through focused collaboration, interventions are generated that can meet the needs of students. After compiling these objectives, new goals are set for the year. These needs were determined by utilizing the following data sources to develop school improvement goals: 2018 State Assessments, SRA placement test, Achieve 3000 Level Set, End of Course results, iReady placements, focus walk observation documentation, and culture & climate survey results from teachers and parents.

The Shared Decision Making Committee will problem-solve around the coordinating and supplementing of federal, state and local funds, services, and programs. The Principal is transparent in the usage of resources that will provide the highest impact. These meetings are held once each month. In addition, Title I Funding will be used to assist with the expenses of purchasing positions in areas that have not been funded by allocated budget. This will support the augmentation of instruction through additional curriculum supplements and technology integration. Title I funds also aid in providing professional development to teachers as needed. Field trips providing students with cultural enrichment are also funded by federal and state allocations.

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.

Matthew Gilbert is a Career Exploration Magnet. Twice per month during the school's early release schedule each student participates in Career Exploration enrichment, where they research potential career fields of their choice. Students have the opportunity to participate in field experiences, and interactions with guest speakers from specific career fields.

At the end of the year students participate in the career fair, local businesses and programs visit the campus and student tour the set up display booths using guided notes and questionnaires. Students are provided with questions and create questions that help to assess the careers and requirements to be successful within the career.

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

need to complete

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Standards Aligned Instruction in ALL content ares classes	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the culture and climate among students, parents and community	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00