

Charlotte County Public Schools

Babcock Neighborhood School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Babcock Neighborhood School

43301 CYPRESS PKWY, Babcock Ranch, FL 33982

www.babcockneighborhoodschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Treece

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
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)	3%
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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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

N/A

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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Babcock Neighborhood School

43301 CYPRESS PKWY, Babcock Ranch, FL 33982

www.babcockneighborhoodschool.org

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)
Combination School KG-12	No	0%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	6%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Create a "place-based" environmentally focused "greenSTEAM" education program that integrates science, technology, engineering, the arts, and mathematics within a thoughtfully provided holistic learning environment.

*By focusing on local landscape, history, culture and context, learning at BNS takes on specificity and moves from the abstract to the concrete, engaging students with an environment that encourages interactions with, and exploration of, the world around them. The sustainability and conservation principles of Babcock Ranch provide opportunities for hands-on, project-based learning about nature, health and renewable energy with a STEAM focus.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through STEAM (Strategies That Engage the Authentic Mind) all students at BNS will find success by blending academic standards with a variety of real-world skills through project based learning. BNS believes that all children should experience learning through their own passions and meaningful experiences. The academic experiences will be rooted in collaboration, critical thinking, and reflection for learning around the growth mindset beliefs as they prepare for the next level of learning.

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
Treece, Shannon	Principal	The principal is to use her leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The principal engages in PLCs to support and guide instructional decisions among grade level teams based on data. The principal provides stakeholders with the dates and times of Governing Board Meetings and SAC meetings to ensure opportunities for collaboration among stakeholders in the school's decision making process.
Fennell, Chris	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is to use his leadership, supervisory and administrative skills, and knowledge of curriculum to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The assistant principal also engages in PLCs to support and guide instructional decisions among grade level teams based on data. The assistant principal facilitates the SAC meetings to ensure that opportunities for stakeholder input and questions are heard and responded to.
Lewter, Kari	Other	The Curriculum Coordinator uses her skills and curriculum knowledge to help teachers develop a better school curriculum and guide data discussions to better their instructional practices. She is also involved with working with the school administrators on assessing students' data with the goal of helping the school raise their overall test scores. The curriculum coordinator engages in curriculum nights designed for stakeholders to offer information based on curriculum implementation taking place within the school.

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	39	58	45	47	39	46	53	50	49	0	0	0	0	426
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	0	3	3	1	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	8	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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)

20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	10	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	10	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	59%	65%	61%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	49%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	55%	60%	62%	0%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	43%	59%	0%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	35%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	60%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	39 (0)	58 (0)	45 (0)	47 (0)	39 (0)	46 (0)	53 (0)	50 (0)	49 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	426 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (0)	8 (1)	0 (0)	3 (1)	3 (2)	1 (2)	5 (2)	7 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (8)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	1 (4)	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (11)	0 (3)	19 (4)	7 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (10)	3 (4)	9 (3)	17 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	37 (19)

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	70%	69%	1%	58%	12%
	2018	78%	63%	15%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
	2018	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
06	2019	57%	49%	8%	54%	3%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	42%	46%	-4%	52%	-10%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	70%	-29%	62%	-21%
	2018	83%	69%	14%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-42%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	60%	-8%	64%	-12%
	2018	32%	61%	-29%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2019	51%	56%	-5%	60%	-9%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
06	2019	57%	51%	6%	55%	2%
	2018	64%	46%	18%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2019	67%	62%	5%	54%	13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	52%	-7%	53%	-8%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	79%	78%	1%	71%	8%
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18			27							
WHT	59	47	47	54	43	37	49	80			
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
WHT	64	63	40	64	70	64	72				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Students with disabilities in ELA Achievement. The introduction of a new curriculum and the depth of academic gaps with limited resources. Another impact was the growth of BNS in the 18-19 school, we more than doubled our population of the school and nearly tripled our ESE population.

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

The math L25 was 64% in 17-18 and 35% in 18-19. The curriculum used was extremely difficult for students who were not on grade level and a lack of resources to serve the students with academic gaps.

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.

3rd-grade math was 22% below the state average for proficiency. The curriculum used was extremely difficult for students who were not on grade level and a lack of resources to serve the students with academic gaps. The students struggled significantly in reading which could have also contributed to their math performance.

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

In comparing actually cohort group scores our 6th and 7th-grade math proficiency increased. For 6th grade, they increased from 70% to 82% and 7th grade increased from 65% to 70%. This was the result of the teacher consistently reviewing data and responding to specific academic gaps.

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

The amount of 6th-grade failures is a concern for BNS. There were 19 failures last year. There were 11 in ELA and 8 in math, there were some students in both categories.

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

1. ESE population performance
2. White math L25s learning gains
3. Math Learning Gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ESE Population Performance
Rationale	Our ESE population was 18% proficient in ELA and 27% proficient in math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to achieve at least 41% proficient in both ELA and Math achievement with our ESE population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. Our small group intervention resources include Dreambox (K-3 math interventions), Lexia (K-5 reading intervention), IXL (3-8 math intervention), NWEA, Barton (K-8 reading).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There is a clear need to support our ESE students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional support. Most importantly it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather baseline data for specified students 2. Develop a learning pathway based on diagnostic data 3. Create a schedule that provides sufficient time for instructional support 4. Monitor specific data for core areas 5. Adjust as needed
Person Responsible	Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

#2	
Title	Math L25 Learning Gains (white)
Rationale	The math L25 proficiency rate for BNS was 37% and the gains decreased from 64% to 35%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to achieve a 64% in the math L25 learning gains performance indicator.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. Our small group intervention resources include Dreambox (K-3 math interventions), IXL (3-8 math intervention), and NWEA (benchmark). We also hired a math intervention teacher to work with students and teachers on developing best practice math instructional strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There is a clear need to support our L25 students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional support. Most importantly it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data.
	The use of our intervention teacher will address current student needs through developing their skills and increase teacher effectiveness for delivering math instruction.
Action Step	
Description	
Person Responsible	Chris Fennell (cfennell@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

#3**Title** Math Learning Gains for all Students**Rationale** The math learning gains for BNS were 43%, very close to the required 41%.**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

The goal is to achieve a 64% in the math learning gains performance indicator for all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. Our small group intervention resources include Dreambox (K-3 math interventions), IXL (3-8 math intervention), and NWEA (benchmark). We also hired a math intervention teacher to work with students and teachers on developing best practice math instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

There is a clear need to support our L25 students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional support. Most importantly it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data.

The use of our intervention teacher will address current student needs through developing their skills and increase teacher effectiveness for delivering math instruction.

Action Step**Description**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person**Responsible** [no one identified]**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.

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

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

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESE Population Performance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math L25 Learning Gains (white)	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains for all Students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00