

The School Board of Highlands County

Cracker Trail Elementary 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	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/>

Demographics

Principal: Richard Kogelschatz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (52%)
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 was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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 Develop Lifelong Learners and Leaders"

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Leading Together To Achieve Excellence"

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
Kogelschatz, Rick	Principal	
Belanger, Ian	Instructional Technology	
Prendergast, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
White, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Pugh-Clogston, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	
Rowe, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Eures, Katherine	Instructional Coach	
Prince, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Brooks, Cara	Teacher, K-12	
	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Travis	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	4	111	105	122	88	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	2	15	13	21	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	2	17	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	21	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	0	5	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/25/2019

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	6	5	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	5	9	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	28	9	28	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	48	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	20	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	13	9	8	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	6	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	28	1	15	26	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	1	1	3	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	53%	50%	57%	58%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	54%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	49%	53%	41%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	64%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	57%	62%	63%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	44%	51%	44%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	45%	53%	53%	47%	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	4 (0)	111 (0)	105 (0)	122 (0)	88 (0)	130 (0)	560 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (0)	15 (6)	13 (5)	21 (7)	10 (9)	16 (8)	77 (35)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (5)	0 (9)	0 (6)	0 (5)	0 (5)	2 (30)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (28)	2 (9)	17 (28)	7 (14)	14 (24)	45 (103)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (39)	21 (48)	65 (29)	100 (116)

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%	50%	13%	58%	5%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
	2018	49%	45%	4%	56%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
	2018	54%	47%	7%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	51%	49%	2%	60%	-9%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	43%	12%	53%	2%
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	21	19	22	27	37	32	17				
ELL	15	27		23	50						
BLK	69	79		40	64		54				
HSP	44	43	41	51	57	26	49				
MUL	27	27		40	55						
WHT	55	53	38	60	61	34	64				
FRL	38	44	42	42	50	34	41				

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	4	12	13	17	20	19	14				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	43	50		29	22						
HSP	41	30	35	56	46	38	54				
MUL	38	40		50	40						
WHT	57	44	30	68	53	33	67				
FRL	44	38	28	54	49	33	49				
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	22	53	43	30	41	29	27				
ELL	25	40		50	50						
BLK	32	35	33	48	41						
HSP	53	57	44	64	60	50	44				
MUL	25	70		44	50						
WHT	65	62	38	66	66	49	58				
FRL	48	55	44	56	54	39	52				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	45
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile 34%

Trend: The trend over the last 3 years has been 44%, 30%, 34%.

Contributing factors: Historically, the students in lowest 25th percentile have struggled to make learning gains, ELA correlation - these students also struggle in ELA (reading the math content and problems), teacher experience, curriculum - built to fit standards - not an ideal flow of instruction from adopted curriculum.

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

Math Achievement 63% (17-18) to 56% (18-19). This was a 7% decrease from the previous year.

Factors that contributed to this decline: 5th grade group from 17-18 high group (71% proficiency), teacher experience, CKLA focus takes time from math planning and instruction.

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 Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.

Math Lowest 25th - 34% (State 51%) Gap = 17%

*There was a 4% increase in the school percentage from 2017/2018 (30%) to 2018/2019 (34%)

*There was also a 4% increase in the state average from 2017/2018 (47%) to 2018/2019 (51%)

Trend: 2017 - 44% (State 51%) Gap = 7%, 2018 - 30% (State 47%) Gap = 17%

Contributing factors: Historically, the students in lowest 25th percentile have struggled to make learning gains, ELA correlation - these students also struggle in ELA (reading the math content and problems), teacher experience, curriculum - built to fit standards - not an ideal flow of instruction from adopted curriculum.

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

English Language Arts for 3rd Grade showed the most improvement for the 2018-2019 school year.

The percent proficient increased by 9% from 54% to 63%.

New actions taken in this area...smaller class size due to an extra teaching unit paid for by the school, experienced team of teachers understanding what they were teaching, common planning, great collaboration.

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

Level 1 on Statewide Assessment - ELA and Math

3rd grade - 14

4th grade - 21

5th grade - 65

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

ELA Learning Gains

Math Learning Gains

Math Lowest 25th Learning Gains

Subgroup Priorities

1. ELL - ELA 15%

2. SWD - Science 17%

3. SWD - ELA LG 19%

4. SWD - ELA 21%

5. SWD - ELA LG Lowest 25 22%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts - Learning Gains
Rationale	<p>ELA Learning Gains for the school was 51% compared to the District 54% and State 58%.</p> <p>Learning Gains would target all students in 4th and 5th grade.</p> <p>Subgroup Rationale</p> <p>SWD 19%</p> <p>ELL 27%</p> <p>Multiracial 27%</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains by 4% from 51% to 55% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Use standards aligned curriculum</p> <p>Models of Effective Instruction</p> <p>Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA Professional Learning Communities 2. Learning Gains PD 3. ELA Curriculum - Core and Supplemental 4. ELA Professional Development 5. MTSS Interventions and Monitoring 6. Progress Monitoring 7. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool 8. Instructional Coach Support
Person Responsible	Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Mathematics - Learning Gains
Rationale	Math Learning Gains for the school was 60% compared to the District 57% and State 62%. Learning Gains would target all students in 4th and 5th grade. Subgroup Rationale SWD 37%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains by 4% from 60% to 64% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan
Action Step	
Description	1. Math Professional Learning Communities 2. Learning Gains PD 3. District Developed Instructional Plans 4. Focused skill instruction 5. Progress Monitoring 6. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool
Person Responsible	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Mathematics - Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
Rationale	Math Learning Gains for the lowest quartile was 34% compared to the District 44% and State 51%. Largest gap compared to the state - 17% Subgroup Rationale SWD 32% HSP 26% WHT 34% FRL 34%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains for the lowest quartile by 4% from 34% to 38% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan Use standards aligned curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Action Step	
Description	1. Math Professional Learning Communities 2. Learning Gains PD 3. Identification and communication of L25 students 4. Focused skill instruction 5. Progress Monitoring
Person Responsible	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

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).

Science

In 2019-2020, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment by 4% from 57% to 61%.

Attendance

Cracker Trail Elementary School will decrease the students with 10 or more absences by 1.7% (15 students) by May 22, 2020.

2017-2018 166 students - 24.2%

2018-2019 61 students - 9.7%

Goal: 2019-2020 46 students - 8%

Discipline

95% of Cracker Trail Elementary School students will earn PBIS events during the 2019-2020 school year.

(Criteria to attend events changed from no referrals to no referrals and no Ns in conduct.)

2018 - 2019

1st nine weeks - 97%
 2nd nine weeks - 96%
 3rd nine weeks - 95%
 4th nine weeks - 94%

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.

To increase parent involvement and build positive relationships with families, as well as increase communication to inform parents of their child's progress, we host:

- Open house and Orientation night
- Report Card Conferences with Parents
- PTO Family Nights - Hoe Down
- Science Fair/ Art Showcase
- Fall Character Parade
- Science Fair/ Art Showcase
- Fall and Winter Meal
- Dads Take Your Child to School Day

In addition we communicate with families and the community through:

- School & Classroom Websites
- School Facebook Page
- Monthly School Newsletters
- Weekly Classroom Newsletters
- Call-Outs to Families (to communicate important information/reminders)
- iOS & Android APP (push messages)
- Student planners/Communication folders
- Leadership notebooks
- DoJo App
- Remind App
- PTO Meetings
- SAC Meetings
- Title I Annual Meeting
- Business Partnerships

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.

CTE addresses the social-emotional needs of all students by providing a full-time guidance resource teacher who conducts class meetings, small groups and individual students focused on social-emotional

skills. Teachers include strategies for ESOL, Gifted, Kagan cooperative learning structures and ESE in their weekly lesson plans.

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

At the beginning of each academic year, and towards the end, grade levels meet together, as well as with the grades before and after, to discuss expectations of students both entering and exiting the grade levels. Members of our leadership team meet with the teachers at the Kindergarten Learning Center, as well as the middle schools, to discuss expectations and individual students' needs. The fifth grade students go to the middle schools in May for an Orientation Field Trip. We also accommodate tours of the school to any families new to Cracker Trail Elementary.

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 MTSS team meets on a regular basis to review student performance and make suggestions for improvement to the core curriculum. In addition, they meet with team leaders and grade levels as needed based on data. The role of the team is to analyze the success of the implemented strategies and to determine if an increased level of intensity or frequency is necessary. The role of the classroom teacher is to implement strategies with fidelity based on data and to collect and analyze the results of the implementation.

More information outlined in the attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan

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

Specific grade levels also participate in career days, inviting community members to come into their classrooms and discuss their occupations and careers with the students. We have partnered with Glades Electric Cooperative and Swaine & Leidel Wealth Service as a business partners. Glades installed and updates our banner art display. Swaine & Leidel sponsor the end of year Science and Math Awards. We also have the Fire Department come to present during Fire Safety Week.