Coppergate Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Coppergate Elementary School

3460 COPPER COLTS COURT, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://cge.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Metz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	65%
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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Clay 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

Coppergate Elementary School

3460 COPPER COLTS COURT, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://cge.oneclay.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 PK-6	No	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Coppergate School of the Arts believes in educating the whole child encompassing academic excellence with the integration of the visual and performing arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Coppergate stakeholders will provide an academic and arts curriculum focusing on communication, creative problem-solving, and interpersonal relationships fostering lifelong learners.

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
Bossinger, Robin	Assistant Principal	
Crane, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Carmichael, Denise	Teacher, K-12	
Miskowski, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Dyal, Amy	Principal	
Rhoden, Kristi	Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Rucker, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Blackwell, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Deck, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Cassada, Renee	Teacher, K-12	

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	74	63	69	83	77	77	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

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	2	1	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	1	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	62%	65%	57%	64%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	62%	58%	65%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	54%	53%	53%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	70%	63%	68%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	66%	62%	68%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	56%	51%	61%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	65%	53%	50%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	74 (0)	63 (0)	69 (0)	83 (0)	77 (0)	77 (0)	84 (0)	527 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)	0 (4)	0 (1)	1 (11)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (4)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (10)	4 (11)	3 (9)	8 (30)

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	68%	68%	0%	58%	10%
	2018	64%	68%	-4%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	64%	-7%	58%	-1%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	56%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	48%	62%	-14%	56%	-8%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	67%	64%	3%	54%	13%
	2018	69%	63%	6%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	70%	71%	-1%	62%	8%
	2018	70%	70%	0%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	69%	-17%	64%	-12%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2019	56%	64%	-8%	60%	-4%
	2018	55%	65%	-10%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2019	64%	70%	-6%	55%	9%
	2018	64%	68%	-4%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	56%	63%	-7%	53%	3%
	2018	63%	64%	-1%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	31	38	21	31	37	27	27				
ELL	50	60		20	50						
BLK	40	41	55	35	52	62					
HSP	59	61		54	55		50				
MUL	60	56		50	44						
WHT	67	58	41	71	60	50	63				
FRL	59	53	39	58	54	40	57				

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	27	41	44	36	59	50	50				
ELL	45			45							
BLK	54	52		43	59						
HSP	69	64		66	57						
MUL	42			67							
WHT	62	54	37	74	74	58	67				
FRL	55	52	46	61	64	54	57				

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	31	47	42	39	53	46	19				
BLK	47	44		53	61						
HSP	54	54		59	66		36				
MUL	50	58		63	83						
WHT	69	71	62	73	68	59	61				
FRL	53	60	50	63	64	56	39				

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	54
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	46
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	48
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	56
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	53
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	
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	59
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	51
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.

Our students with disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance (ELA Ach 31%, ELA LG 38%, ELA LG L25% - 21%, Math Ach 31%, Math LG 37%, Math LG L25%-27%, and Sci 27%). The contributing factors to last year's low performance is due to high numbers of SWD students and low numbers of staff to assist those students. Our SWD students are significantly below grade level (2 years or more). Due to low staff numbers we had difficulty of closing the gap and educating with the level of rigor to increase our levels in all areas.

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

The data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math LG L25% (2018- 50% dropped to 27% in 2019) The contributing factors to last year's low performance is due to high numbers of SWD students and low numbers of staff to assist those students. Our SWD students are significantly below grade level (2 years or more). Due to low staff numbers we had difficulty of closing the gap and educating with the level of rigor to increase our levels in all areas.

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.

ELA L25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average by 12%. The contributing factors to last year's low performance is due to high numbers of SWD students and lower numbers of staff to assist those students. The contributing factors to last year's low performance is due to high numbers of SWD students and low numbers of staff to assist those students. Our SWD students are significantly below grade level (2 years or more). Due to low staff numbers we had difficulty of closing the gap and educating with the level of rigor to increase our levels in all areas.

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 ELA LG by 2%. We increased rigor and resources. We also utilized more small group settings.

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

The area of concern is Students with Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the current year.

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

1. Learning Gains in all Areas
2. LQ Learning Gains in all areas
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading and Math Students with Disabilities Support
Rationale	The inclusion of a fourth Varying Exceptionalities teacher will work with the identified students. The work will include working in small groups to close the gap and to increase rigor.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase learning gains in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady Math and Eureka. MAFS and iReady toolkit in small groups- intensive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The VE teachers will support the general education teacher in the classroom and small groups. We will use iReady diagnostic data and Achieve 3000 data.

Action Step	
Description	1. The teachers will be provided professional development in increasing rigor and intentional small groups. 2. Feedback from walkthroughs 3. Quarterly data meetings 4. Teachers will be provided professional development in Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) to help sequence student ideas to deepen mathematical reasoning and develop mathematical thinkers through instructional routines. 5. District educators collaborate and work with teachers weekly to help support needs in implementing Eureka Math. 6, Title I coach supports, intervention needs, whole group instruction, data analysis, and support of SWD learners in the classroom. 7. Chromebooks help reduce transitional times between classrooms, increase usage on online pathways, allows students to share idea, and review immediate feedback via real time from their teachers.
Person Responsible	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Curriculum
Rationale	By including SEL curriculum school wide students will create and achieve personal goals.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome will be lower guidance referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement the 7 Mindsets each day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We saw an increase in students who needed emotional support in 2018.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will receive professional development in The 7 Mindsets 2. Teachers will implement The 7 Mindsets 3. The Colts with Character program is aligned with The 7 Mindsets 4. Title I coach supports data analysis and whole group instruction 5. Chromebooks will help reduce transitional times between classrooms and increase usage on online pathways
Person Responsible	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	Integration of knowledge and ideas
Rationale	We saw a decline in students supporting their thinking from integration of their knowledge and ideas via writing from 83% to 68%. This was indicated on the district/school Insight Survey.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will see an increase in this area on the district/school Insight Survey and increase in the strand of integration of knowledge and ideas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will write in journals to support their thinking across multiple subject areas. We will increase the usage of Achieve 3000 to expose them to content specific vocabulary and high-quality non-fiction reading. Utilize LAFS as a resource to practice multiple pieces of text which is similar to their assessment task.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will see an increase in students supporting their thinking in writing and an increase in the strand of integration of knowledge and ideas.
Action Step	
Description	1. Purchase journals for K-5 students in multiple subject areas 2. Increase Achieve 3000 usage 3. Using LAFS as a resource 4, Title I Coach supports whole group instruction and data analysis 5. Chromebooks help reduce transitional times, differentiate instruction, and increase usage on online pathways
Person Responsible	Amy Dyal (amy.dyal@myoneclay.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.

Coppergate School of the Arts works at building positive relationships with families to increase involvement by utilizing the Clay County School District Parent Portal, Parent Volunteer Organization newsletter, classroom newsletters, school and class webpages, our school Facebook page, parent-teacher conferences, Parent Nights, and an open door policy with the administration and guidance department.

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.

Coppergate School of the Arts ensures the social-emotional needs of all students by utilizing the following; 7 Mindsets Program, Making Meaning reading program, Being a Writer, Fountas & Pinnell, Lucy Calkins writing program, guidance counselor push in classroom instruction, guidance referrals, MFLC, and Behavior Resource Teacher.

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

Most of our kindergarten students have been in preschool. In order to assist these students in the transition from preschool to an elementary school setting, during registration, tours of the school are conducted upon request. The first two days of kindergarten are staggered enrollment with the first day for students whose birthday occurs before February 1st of the current school year and the day two for the remainder of the students. During their staggered enrollment days, the students are oriented to the school, introduced to the staff, the cafeteria procedures, drop-off and pick-up procedures. Before school opens, orientation is conducted for the parents and students to meet the teacher, see the classroom and the entire school, and meet most of the remainder of the staff. During Open House, the parents meet the teacher who explains the rituals and routines.

CSA works closely with our feeder schools to ensure our students are prepared for Junior High.

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.

All K-6 grade students will take diagnostic assessments three times per year. School-based leadership teams will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

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

CSA works closely with our feeder schools, specifically LAJH to ensure our students are prepared for Junior High. We have the guidance counselor from LAJH come speak to our students about course selections, what to expect when starting junior high, dress code, extracurricular activities, etc. The sixth grade students visit LAJH to tour the school. We also have our guidance counselor talk to the students about what skills they need to be successful in junior high, including study skills, communicating with teachers, time management, personal responsibility, etc. Students on the school news team attend field trips to a local news station.