

Orange County Public Schools

William Frangus Elementary



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	0

William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://franguses.ocps.net/>**Demographics****Principal: Decheryl Britton**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/7/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (41%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://franguses.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	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	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

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
Britton, DeCheryl	Principal	Mrs. Britton is the building level administrator who oversees the daily school operations and curricula implementation school wide. In addition, she ensures the fiscal and non fiscal resources are appropriately utilized to foster a well rounded learning environment for students and staff, and the communication of routine updates to community and staff in regards to district-wide initiatives and requirements.
Webster, Arlene	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Webster is the 2nd-5th grade ELA Coach and 4th and 5th grade Writing Coach. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, Mrs. Webster is the beginning teacher Lead coordinator and the FSA testing administrator.
Glover, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ms. Ashley Glover is Kindergarten and the First grade Instructional Coach for ELA and Math & MTSS Coordinator. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. As the MTSS coordinator, she oversees the intervening process for students who need additional academic support and/or a diversified educational plan.
Brooks, Janelle	School Counselor	Ms. Janelle Brooks is the the Guidance Counselor who ensures that the social-emotional wellbeing of all students are taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.
Latham, Jalma	Dean	Mrs. Latham is the Administrative Dean who oversees school wide discipline as well as having an academic focus on 4th grade math. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, she is the MTSS Behavior Coordinator overseeing the intervention process for students who need additional supports to foster a safe and productive learning environment.
Gilbert, Sharna	Other	Mrs. Gilbert is the Staffing Specialist/Curriculum Compliance Teacher. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based upon their needs as depicted through the MTSS process and then transitioning to the individual exceptional student plan. In addition, she oversees the parent leadership council and monitors and maintains ELL compliance.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	3	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	32	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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)

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/6/2019

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	15	11	14	8	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	8	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	2	1	2	1	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	15	11	14	8	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	8	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	2	1	2	1	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	50%	57%	57%	41%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	58%	58%	59%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	71%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	63%	63%	53%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	61%	62%	68%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	48%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	56%	53%	34%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (15)	13 (11)	3 (14)	8 (8)	12 (10)	14 (13)	57 (71)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (2)	0 (9)	3 (7)	4 (21)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (4)	5 (8)	1 (4)	2 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	11 (18)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (32)	32 (38)	43 (28)	100 (98)

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	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	18	38	42	28	50	36	30				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	41	61	62	48	47	36	53				
BLK	49	62	70	49	46	21	49				
HSP	42	45		60	50		56				
WHT	64	60		59	48		43				
FRL	45	55	55	48	46	29	44				
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	21	38	33	37	45	38	27				
ELL	26	40		44	40						
BLK	41	57	47	45	48	44	37				
HSP	41	38	27	59	39	9	36				
WHT	58	77		52	65						
FRL	45	56	41	48	46	37	38				
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	16	50	73	30	45	33	13				
ELL	28	57	67	49	70	50	13				
BLK	35	58	71	48	65	55	28				
HSP	41	63		62	73		52				
WHT	58	50		54	68		23				
FRL	41	58	71	53	69	53	34				

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	49
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	51
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	55
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	46
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.

As identified on FSA 2019 Math learning gains and bottom 25% showed the lowest performance. In comparison with FSA 2018 Math data, learning gains and bottom 25% dropped as compared to the FSA 2017 Math data. Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass teacher preparation for delivery of instruction, and inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

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

As identified on FSA 2019 Math, the bottom 25% showed the greatest decline from 37% to 27% being proficient/show learning gains. Contributing factor for the decline is inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

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 compared to state average on FSA 2019 is the Lowest 25th percentile (bottom 25%) in Math. Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass teacher preparation for delivery of instruction, and inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

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

As indicated on the 2019 Science Assessment, 5th grade science performance increased by 10 points from the 2018 Science Assessment (41% to 51%). Science teachers and leadership team created lesson plans that supported the standards coupled with hands-on experiments to scaffold student learning and deepen their understanding of science concepts. Science Saturday enrichment also played a vital part in the academic success.

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

The number of level 1's in ELA or Math increased from the previous year by 2 students.

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

1. Math Bottom 25%
2. Math Learning gains
3. Math Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Math Bottom 25%

Rationale Data shows a trend of the bottom 25% in math continuing to drop in academic performance.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

The expectation is that the bottom 25% in Math will increase from 27% to 40% as measured by the FSA 20 Math state assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Differentiated small group instruction based on whole group and common assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

It will meet the needs of all learners and increase fluency and accuracy.

Action Step

Description

Teachers will collaborate during common planning to plan for differentiated whole group and small group instruction that is culturally relevant. Professional learning communities will meet to discuss common assessments and next steps for targeted instruction. In addition, teachers will conduct student data chats to hold students accountable for their learning and academic success. Administration will conduct teacher data chats to ensure consistent data monitoring and targeted instructional support for identified students.

Person Responsible

DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Data shows a trend of the learning gains in math continuing to drop in academic performance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The expectation is that the learning gains in Math will increase from 48% to 55% as measured by the FSA 20 Math state assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will use math academic vocabulary and writing to orally communicate with peers and teacher as well as in written formation to deepen their understanding of the math concept/skill. Monitoring will be done through teacher, coach and principal observation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through these multiple processing methods, students will gain greater automaticity with mathematics concepts as they will see the content, write it, and speak it many times.
Action Step	
Description	Provide teachers with ongoing various professional learning opportunities that allow them to gain more competence in the area of engaging students in academic discourse conversations and writing across the content area. Coach and principal will monitor through classroom walks/observations on a regular basis and provide feedback to teachers on instructional methodologies to improve academic discourse and writing across the content area to improve classroom instruction. Teacher will provide immediate feedback to students in regards to verbal and written communication as it relates to the standard(s) in whole group and small group work assignments and/or discussions.
Person Responsible	DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Students With Disabilities
Rationale	The achievement gap for the Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below was 41% as indicated on the ESSA FSA 2019 performance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The expectation is that the Students with Disabilities subgroup performance will increase to 42% or higher on the ESSA FSA 20 state assessment performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sharna Gilbert (sharna.gilbert@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It will provide the opportunity for more examples and non examples and language to facilitate student understanding, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESE Professional development- learning strategies 2. Data monitoring through CIM, data chats, data meetings 3. Professional Learning Community- common assessment data and next steps 4. General Education teacher, Support Facilitator and Staffing specialist will collaborate and determine best practices for explicit instruction based on the standard 5. The leadership team will monitor the use of explicit instruction strategies by classroom observations, common assessment data and iReady weekly data
Person Responsible	Sharna Gilbert (sharna.gilbert@ocps.net)

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.

Frangus Elementary is a Title 1 school and has completed the Parental Involvement Plan. The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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.

The Staffing Specialist works closely with the feeder Pre-K VE schools to ensure a successful and seamless

transition to Frangus Elementary.

Representatives from the guidance department and administration from our feeder middle schools, Gotha and Robinswood Middle, work with 5th grade teachers to collaboratively plan visits to our school to inform 5th graders of transitioning information, develop student schedules and conduct off campus tours of the middle school. Students are provided an opportunity to speak with the guidance counselor at both schools to hear forthcoming expectations.

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

-Once a teacher identifies a student as in need of intervention, she/he provide intervention within the core curriculum (Tier 1).

-Tier II intervention is designed to improve student performance with Tier I performance expectations. Instruction focuses on specific skills that pose a barrier to the acceleration of student learning. Tier III Intervention is the most intensive and frequent. It is noted when students are in Tier III, their Tier II intervention was not sufficient as indicated on progress monitoring identified through formative and summative assessments.

-Tier III intervention strategies include, but are not limited to, additional support time provided by a Resource Teacher or ESE Resource Teacher. Interventions indicate additional structured time is designated to specifically support students' individual academic learning needs. Each intervention is built upon collectively to ensure all academic gaps are addressed and monitored to ensure continued academic progression. Throughout the MTSS process, parents are kept informed of their student's progress or lack thereof. Parents are an integral part of the MTSS process

-Attendance is monitored by Registrar, and discipline is monitored by administration.

-Title 1 funds are used: hire support teachers, supplement intervention materials, parent engagement activities, professional development, and after-school tutoring for identified students.

-SAI funds are utilized to purchase research based curriculum for after-school tutoring.

-The Guidance Counselor is the Migrant Liaison and MVP coordinator. Services and support are provided to families as deemed appropriate.

-Grade level coaches along with teachers will develop culturally responsive lessons plans.

-Orange County receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with the district Dropout Prevention Program.

-Funds for educational services, resources, and ELL support are provided through the district to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

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.

William Frangus Elementary implements several strategies to advance college and career awareness. All faculty members display their college or university alma mater in their classrooms in addition to faculty and students wearing collegiate paraphernalia every Wednesday. Fifth-grade students also have an opportunity to visit the feeder pattern middle school to gain knowledge of sixth-grade expectations and extra curricular activities.

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

The Staffing Specialist works closely with the feeder Pre-K VE schools to ensure a successful and seamless transition to Frangus Elementary.

Representatives from the guidance department and administration from our feeder middle schools, Gotha and Robinswood Middle, work with 5th grade teachers to collaboratively plan visits to our school to inform 5th graders of transitioning information, develop student schedules and conduct off campus tours of the middle school. Students are provided an opportunity to speak with the guidance counselor at both schools to hear forthcoming expectations. In addition Teach In is done each year to provide all students with the opportunity to learn and explore various careers through presentations and hands on activities.