

Polk County Public Schools

Bethune Academy



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	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bethune Academy

900 AVENUE F, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bethune>

Demographics

Principal: Robin Hewitt

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 (52%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: C (51%)
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

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bethune Academy

900 AVENUE F, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bethune>

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 PK-5	Yes	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Bethune Academy values the unique qualities of each person and believes that everyone has the capacity to learn. We expect all learners to attend and show effort, meet the required curriculum, develop responsibility, citizenship, and leadership. We dedicate ourselves to the success of this mission.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision to be a leader in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education by inspiring and preparing generations of critical and creative thinkers to meet the challenges of a global society through innovation and collaboration.

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
Carns, Michelle	School Counselor	
Knowles, Sharon	Principal	
Rivera, Deborah	Instructional Coach	
Wilkins, Lucus	Assistant Principal	
McIntee, Ashlee	Instructional Coach	
Bataille, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Kobs, Mary	Instructional Coach	

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	69	73	71	71	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

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	7	7	8	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	3	8	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	3	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	7	7	8	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	3	8	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	3	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	51%	57%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	63%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	49%	53%	47%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	57%	63%	56%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	57%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	51%	43%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	53%	44%	46%	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	69 (0)	73 (0)	71 (0)	71 (0)	76 (0)	90 (0)	450 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (7)	0 (7)	0 (8)	0 (6)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (38)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (8)	0 (0)	0 (5)	0 (7)	0 (4)	0 (27)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (4)	0 (0)	0 (18)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (21)	0 (22)	0 (22)	0 (65)

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	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	48%	10%	58%	0%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	56%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	49%	47%	2%	56%	-7%
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	56%	-2%	62%	-8%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	56%	-1%	64%	-9%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	60%	51%	9%	60%	0%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
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	27			27							
ELL	45	37	40	56	61	40	39				
BLK	37	49	48	37	49	42	44				
HSP	60	47	36	64	63	44	51				
WHT	75	58		71	73		50				
FRL	46	46	39	44	52	40	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	38			54							
ELL	49	45	46	49	35	30					
BLK	52	41	22	51	52	33	41				
HSP	68	53	50	62	48	42	75				
WHT	74	54		68	61		72				
FRL	62	46	32	54	49	37	56				
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	12			28	40						
ELL	49	67		38	57	55					
BLK	51	58	36	42	41	38	27				
HSP	64	70	58	60	67	53	43				
WHT	68	60		71	64		65				
FRL	51	56	46	53	55	42	27				

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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	47
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	
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	44
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	53
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	65
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	47
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is our ELA lowest 25%. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the following: poor attendance in school and after-school tutoring programs, severe behavioral issues, and lack of time to provide support during the day as well as our low performing SWD population identified by ESSA. Currently they are performing at 27% proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Science. The contributing factors to last year's decline were the following: decline in comprehension skills overall in the 2018-2019 fifth grade group, severe behavioral issues, and lack of time to provide consistent support during the day.

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 that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average is our ELA lowest 25%. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the following: poor attendance in school and after-school tutoring programs, severe behavioral issues, and lack of time to provide support during the day.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our lowest 25% in ELA. The new actions that we took in this area were the following: targeted tutoring during one special area block per week taught by instructional coaches, and assigning mentors from our Leadership Team to struggling students.

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

Reviewing the EWS data from Part I (D), the identified potential area of concern is attendance.

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

1. Improve lowest 25% in ELA.
2. Improve school wide behavior, character and sense of community.
3. Improve overall performance of our SWD population.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Lowest 25% in ELA

Rationale Based on the data reviewed this area of focus was identified as our greatest area of deficiency. Performing below district and state averages is indicative of our tending data.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Our school plans to attain 43% proficiency to match the state average of the 2018-2019 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Sharon Knowles (sharon.knowles@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy The following strategy will be implemented for success: MTSS, in-school tutoring by Instructional Coaches, mentoring provided by the Leadership Team and the Learning Science Institute's (LSI) best practice of Academic Teaming.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy "The brain that does the work is the brain that learns" as quoted from the Power of Student Teams by Toth and Sousa. Student engagement increases as students have the opportunity to share their thinking, respectfully challenge the thinking of their peers and deepen their learning.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide professional development on the Power of Student Teams.
2. Implement the practice of Student Teams in all grade levels.
3. On-going support provided through weekly PLC's
4. Title 1 Para will be pushing into classroom to support students.
5. Title 1 Literacy Coach will support classroom teachers.
6. Extended Learning provided.
7. Collaborative planning
8. Classroom libraries
9. Subscriptions

Person Responsible Sharon Knowles (sharon.knowles@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	School wide behavior, motivation and sense of community
Rationale	Overall attendance data for tutoring and discipline data indicate an increase in student referrals and suspensions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To decrease the number of behavioral disruptions/office referrals by 30%, while increasing student attendance school wide.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Carns (michelle.carns@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Ron Clark Academy (RCA) House System
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Ron Clark Academy House System will build a culture of respect, confidence, collaboration, and a sense of belonging among our students, staff, and community.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School based professional development on (RCA) 2. Purchase materials and supplies to support the RCA House System. 3. Assign houses to staff and students 4. Provide continued support under the direction of the House Council and Leadership Team. 5. Field Trips
Person Responsible	Ashlee McIntee (ashlee.mcintee@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Increase student performance of our Students With Disabilities (SWD) population.
Rationale	Based on the federal ESSA report we fell below our targeted performance in the area of SWD.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD are currently performing at 27% and we must increase this subgroup to 40% based on federal ESSA Mandate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sharon Knowles (sharon.knowles@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The following strategy will be implemented for success: MTSS, in-school tutoring by Instructional Coaches, mentoring provided by the Leadership Team and the Learning Science Institute's (LSI) best practice of Academic Teaming.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"The brain that does the work is the brain that learns" as quoted from the Power of Student Teams by Toth and Sousa. Student engagement increases as students have the opportunity to share their thinking, respectfully challenge the thinking of their peers and deepen their learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide professional development on the Power of Student Teams. 2. Implement the practice of Student Teams in all grade levels. 3. On-going support provided through weekly PLC's
Person Responsible	Ashlee McIntee (ashlee.mcintee@polk-fl.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).

Our other school wide improvement priorities would be lowest 25% in math and increasing overall science performance in fifth grade,

The following strategy will be implemented for success: MTSS, in-school tutoring by Instructional Coaches, mentoring provided by the Leadership Team and the Learning Science Institute's (LSI) best practice of Academic Teaming, additional math and science classroom resources and field experiences.

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.

Portfolio Conferences
PTO Facebook Page
School Facebook
School and Grade Level Websites
Grade Level Newsletters
School Calendar
PTO Newsletter
Spirit Day / Celebration
STEM Family Nights
National Elementary Honor Society
Field Day / STEM Olympics
Volunteer Program
Daily Agenda Planners
Open Door Policy
Administrative Newsletters
School Advisory Council
Parent Teacher Association
School Messenger
E-mail Communication
Special Events: Concerts, Art Shows, "Boo-hoo Woo-hoo" parent meeting.
Business Partner: Miracle Toyota (donate bikes to children each month to reward for positive character traits, donated book bags and supplies for every child at our school)
Community Partner: Solivita volunteers and reads to children (donate books, school supplies, clothing, personal hygiene items and toys to students)
Community Partner: The Junior League of Greater Winter Haven (set up mobile food pantry on our campus for the community)
Community Partner: Northeast Polk Chamber of Commerce
Business Partner: CEMEX (outdoor classroom field trips and donation of supplies)

We believe that parent involvement is essential in student success. We strive to ensure that communication is a priority that links home to school.

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.

Our school culture has established a safe and intentionally welcoming environment that nurtures the social-emotional needs of all students. Our Administration and Guidance Counselor have an open door policy that fosters communication among all stakeholders. They are readily available at the time of need.

Students who exhibit additional social-emotional needs are matched with staff mentors and/or various counseling groups.

Morning Meetings are held in each classroom every morning to focus on the positive character traits using Keys To Character and Harmony.

Build a culture of respect, confidence and cooperation by utilizing Ron Clark Academy House System.

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

Students transitioning from elementary to middle school attend a school visit at our feeder school where pertinent information is presented to assist with the transition. Our Guidance Counselor facilitates registration for the transitioning students in conjunction with our fifth grade teachers. Our students are automatically accepted to Daniel Jenkins Academy for middle school; their STEM staff comes to our school to do a brief orientation with our 5th grade students and include them in several hands-on STEM activities.

Our students attend a Career Expo annually to become familiar with the different middle school options in our district.

Pre-K students and families are invited to attend school programs. Kindergarten Round-Up is held in May to meet our upcoming Kindergarten students and parents.

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.

Leadership Team meetings are held weekly and guided by a structured agenda prepared by the administration. The agenda is based on current needs and unfinished business from previous discussions. Minutes from each Leadership Team meeting will be recorded and disseminated in a timely manner to each member. Each person brings their area of expertise to the table and is assigned tasks based on prioritized needs in the following areas:

Students with Disabilities, Lowest 25%, School Wide Behavior, Motivation and Sense of Community.

Title I funds support these areas of need by providing: In-school tutoring, Extended Learning, personnel, classroom libraries, subscriptions, resources and supplies.

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

Great American Teach-In, The WE3 EXPO, Miracle Toyota, CEMEX, Chamber of Commerce, Grad Walk (inviting former B.A. students who are graduating from High School).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest 25% in ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School wide behavior, motivation and sense of community	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase student performance of our Students With Disabilities (SWD) population.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00