Freedom Middle

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://freedomms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Robert Walker   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (60%)
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

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://freedomms.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

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

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
Leavitt, Cheri	Principal	Responsible for the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs and safety of all on campus.
Cruz, Agnes	Assistant Principal	Assistant the principal with the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs and safety of all on campus.
Brown, Denine	Assistant Principal	Assistant the principal with the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs and safety of all on campus.
Robinson Taylor, Roxann	Dean	Responsible for the safety of all students on campus.
Cox, Angela	Instructional Technology	Digital Media Specialist
Cook, Lydia	Instructional Coach	Coaching Observations; Celebrates successes of students and instructional staff
Howland, Patrick	Other	Curriculum Resource Teacher (CCT), Testing Coordinator
Leach, Renee	Other	Reading Specialist: Reading Coach, Coaching Cycle and Modeled Instruction
Epifano, Penelope	Other	SAFE Coordinator, Threat Response Protocols and Interventions, Mental Health Designee and Community Resource Liaison
Storms, Jacqueline	Other	MTSS and 504 Cordinator
Ross, Shannon	Dean	Responsible for the safety of all students on campus.
Bonilla, Maria	Other	Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT) responsible for all federal, state and district mandates governing the education of our English language learners (ELLs)
Escanellas, Mariedith	Dean	Responsible for the safety of all students on campus.

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	445	490	471	0	0	0	0	1406
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	73	97	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	47	0	0	0	0	187
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	79	70	0	0	0	0	232
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	220	193	0	0	0	0	575

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	122	117	106	0	0	0	0	345

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
79

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/30/2019

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	58	44	92	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	46	53	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	42	61	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	157	177	0	0	0	0	520

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	100	70	95	0	0	0	0	265

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	73	73	97	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	46	53	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	42	61	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	157	177	0	0	0	0	520

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	100	70	95	0	0	0	0	265

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	47%	52%	54%	58%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	52%	54%	59%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	47%	51%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	55%	58%	59%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	55%	57%	56%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	51%	43%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	53%	51%	51%	45%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	67%	72%	70%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	445 (0)	490 (0)	471 (0)	1406 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	73 (58)	73 (44)	97 (92)	243 (194)
One or more suspensions	68 (78)	72 (46)	47 (53)	187 (177)
Course failure in ELA or Math	83 (58)	79 (42)	70 (61)	232 (161)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	162 (186)	220 (157)	193 (177)	575 (520)

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	40%	52%	-12%	54%	-14%
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	52%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	48%	-13%	52%	-17%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	39%	43%	-4%	55%	-16%
	2018	31%	35%	-4%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	21%	36%	-15%	46%	-25%
	2018	32%	32%	0%	45%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	43%	49%	-6%	48%	-5%
	2018	31%	49%	-18%	50%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
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	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
2018	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
Compare		0%			

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	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%
2018	76%	65%	11%	56%	20%
Compare		18%			

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	16	29	17	21	43	38	25	38			
ELL	30	47	41	40	52	51	33	45	72		
ASN	78	62		70	55		72	88	84		
BLK	40	44	28	46	48	57	33	57	84		
HSP	42	47	41	49	54	55	49	59	76		
MUL	45	36		64	55						
WHT	56	48	35	66	57	68	68	69	88		
FRL	43	45	36	50	52	55	48	54	79		

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	16	42	44	28	48	51	21	26	70		
ELL	25	46	48	37	64	60	16	42	81		
ASN	81	68		91	74		74	84	100		
BLK	43	42	46	45	50	48	32	57	65		
HSP	46	47	44	52	56	59	32	69	76		

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
MUL	71	53		63	60		60		83		
WHT	63	57	65	66	59	60	42	67	74		
FRL	52	50	47	57	57	58	38	68	76		

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	14	39	37	27	37	30	13	44			
ELL	29	54	52	35	48	35	11	38	71		
ASN	80	76		83	75		67	90	97		
BLK	49	54	33	48	53	44	41	75	94		
HSP	55	58	51	54	53	38	39	65	80		
MUL	79	71		83	61			82	100		
WHT	65	60	56	71	64	68	58	70	87		
FRL	58	59	51	59	56	43	45	70	85		

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	56
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	73
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	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	54
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	50
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	60
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	53
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.

8th Grade Mathematics and 7th Grade FSA ELA in the lowest quartile showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors for math include the placement of all Level 3s (as indicated on the 7th grade Math FSA) in Algebra I Honors. Improved professional development is needed for the 8th grade teachers in scaffolding, creating hands-on learning experiences, and effective use of math vocabulary strategies. Contributing factors for ELA include the lack of school wide high yield literacy strategies, including effective vocabulary instruction strategies, and support for the development of print rich physical or digital classroom environments to support English language acquisition.

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

FSA ELA learning gains in the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors included lack of school-wide high yield literacy strategies, including effective vocabulary instruction strategies, and support for the development of print-rich physical or digital classroom environments to support English language acquisition.

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.

8th Grade Mathematics showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors for math include the placement of all Level 3s (as indicated on the 7th grade Math FSA) in Algebra I Honors. Improved professional development is needed for the 8th-grade teachers in scaffolding, creating hands-on learning experiences, and effective use of math vocabulary strategies.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement due to increased collaboration through release days and, data-driven instruction using Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) data which identified gaps from the prior year. Lessons were developed and implemented to address the gaps in learning. Team teaching was implemented to support the students with current and prior standards.

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

The greatest area of concern is the number of students with two or more indicators.

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

1. School-Wide High Yield Literacy Strategies
2. Culturally Responsive Practices
3. School-Wide Writing Strategies
4. Collaborative Planning
5. Professional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ongoing emphasis on understanding and implementation of curriculum facilitated collaborative planning through choosing appropriate content specific complex texts and school wide writing strategies across all content areas.
Rationale	Teachers and administrators require additional training to support the complexity of the continuing process to effectively choose appropriate content specific complex texts and assign standards-aligned writing tasks, and modify instructional practice based on student evidence.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Instructional and administrative staff will increase their knowledge, understanding, and reinforcement of curriculum facilitated collaborative planning through choosing appropriate content specific complex texts and assign standards-aligned writing tasks. Modifications to instructional practice will be measured through formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Academic vocabulary is displayed to develop comprehension. Such teacher evidence may include word walls or charts either in the physical or digital classroom. Student evidence includes signs of annotating the text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers struggle with recognizing how the Literary Evidences are implemented in planning and classroom instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. The Leadership team will meet weekly to share progress reports, observations, commendations and recommendations as observed by visiting classrooms and attending content collaboration. 2. Follow-up instructional coaching will be provided to individual teachers or departments as needed.
Person Responsible	Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Ongoing examination of strategies needed to narrow the achievement gap observed among students from diverse backgrounds by providing professional learning and support to instructional staff.
Rationale	Teachers will be provided with training to build capacity in the utilization of high yield strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs) to support learning gains across all content areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Instructional staff will increase their understanding, engagement, and implementation of standards-based instruction to support English Language Learners by providing high-yield instructional strategies that support learning and narrow the achievement gap by providing opportunities to participate in professional development. Modifications to instructional practice will be measured through formative assessments. (Division Priority #1: Accelerate Student Performance, Division Priority #2: Invest in Human Capital)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Academic vocabulary will be front-loaded and cognates will be used to develop comprehension. Such teacher evidence may include word walls or charts either in the physical or digital classroom. Student evidence includes being able to demonstrate an understanding of the content through verbal or written response.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers struggle with the utilization of high yield strategies developed to increase learning gains of English language learners (ELLs).

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will receive staff development on how to incorporate high-yield strategies for academic vocabulary acquisition for English Language Learners (ELLs) across the content areas.
Person Responsible	Lydia Cook (lydia.cook@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, § 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.

The guidance department provides comprehensive guidance services to all students at Freedom Middle School via a needs assessment completed by every student during the first grading period of each school year. The guidance counselors provide small group and one-on-one counseling for a variety of student needs based on the results of the needs assessment. Services identified from the needs assessment may include but are not limited to grief, divorce, depression, and social skills. The guidance department partners with SEDNET agencies to provide support in the home environment as well as at school. Additional school resource personnel such as the school social worker, school psychologist, and school resource officer are all part of the school team which addresses the social and emotional needs of all students.

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

The Principal and Assistant Principals visit both feeder and sending schools to hold articulation meetings with staff members pertinent to the exchanging of information and preparation for the upcoming academic year. Guidance counselors visit the feeder schools and meet with students, assist them with course selection, and ensure that all students have access to services addressing their academic, career, social personal, and multicultural needs. The school hosts an annual orientation session called "Panther Charge" for incoming 6th-graders to introduce the incoming students to school personnel, special programs, and provides an opportunity to tour the school campus. Students begin their career planning beginning in seventh grade by completing "Choices", a career exploration program. High school counselors conduct a presentation and hold registration sessions with 8th-graders to assist them with completing a four-year high school plan to meet their educational goals.

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.

The leadership team collaborated over the summer to develop a streamlined intervention process that notifies all team members and provides specific examples of steps taken at each tier of intervention. Such interventions include:
• Teacher coaching and mentoring
• Professional development
• Lesson study

• Weekly classroom walkthroughs with focused feedback
• Continuous Improvement Model
• Mentoring program
• Guidance services
• Tutoring

Title X- Homeless: Penelope Epifano is designated as our Homeless Coordinator, facilitating/ coordinating the following services: information on shelters, food pantries, clothing assistance, school supplies, medical services, mental health services, and possible assistance with utility bills. She also coordinates with the Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) social worker, acts as a liaison with the McKinney Vento Act (MVP), assists with bus services for MVP students, and monitors the compliance of applying the MVP law for our homeless population. We are able to use a voucher program for the MVP students for school functions and field trips. Our Homeless Coordinator informs the faculty, as appropriate, with the approval of MVP students and their families.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): Used to purchase 1.29 positions for intensive reading, which will assist in building the academic foundation of our lowest 25%.

Nutrition Programs: All students receive free breakfast and lunch.

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

Academic and career planning is addressed with all students in the eighth grade through our guidance department. Our 8th-grade guidance counselor assists students in selecting a path of study and building a plan for the future. Our CTE and Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) programs help students to make connections to future jobs and college pathways. Students participate in field trips and career nights, where business and community representatives share their services with students. During the school year, various meetings and large presentations such as TeachIn are held to inform students about the relationship between academic and career planning with major emphasis and focus placed on students moving towards high school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Ongoing emphasis on understanding and implementation of curriculum facilitated collaborative planning through choosing appropriate content specific complex texts and school wide writing strategies across all content areas.**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Ongoing examination of strategies needed to narrow the achievement gap observed among students from diverse backgrounds by providing professional learning and support to instructional staff.**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00