

The School Board of Highlands County

Lake Country 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	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lake Country Elementary School

516 COUNTY ROAD 29, Lake Placid, FL 33852

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Halloran

Start Date for this Principal: 9/2/2019

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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (46%)
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	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lake Country Elementary School

516 COUNTY ROAD 29, Lake Placid, FL 33852

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

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	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

Lake Country Elementary School's Mission Statement:
Lake Country is a place where leaders are nurtured,
Excellence is encouraged,
Academic goals are achieved, and
Dreams become realities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Growing Leaders, One Child at a Time"

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
Ward, Shane	Principal	
Veley, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Wirick, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Nitz, Donna	Teacher, K-12	
Duncan, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Rogers, Gitona	Teacher, K-12	
Ming, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	
Baker, Jennifer	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	98	91	85	92	83	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	531
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	5	9	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	4	5	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
	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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	13	4	6	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/3/2019

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	15	10	13	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	10	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	

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	15	10	13	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	10	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	

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	46%	50%	57%	40%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	58%	48%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	53%	42%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	57%	63%	57%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	57%	62%	59%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	44%	51%	52%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	45%	53%	30%	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	98 (0)	91 (0)	85 (0)	92 (0)	83 (0)	82 (0)	531 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 (0)	9 (15)	5 (10)	9 (13)	7 (9)	19 (10)	66 (57)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	28 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (10)	27 (23)	34 (34)	70 (67)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	42%	50%	-8%	58%	-16%
	2018	36%	48%	-12%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	49%	-2%	58%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
	2018	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	55%	49%	6%	60%	-5%
	2018	57%	52%	5%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	42	50	40	62	59	24				
ELL	17	50	53	41	59	60	20				
BLK	23	40	27	34	47	55	20				
HSP	42	56	54	55	63	54	36				
WHT	61	63	67	74	79	82	65				
FRL	43	54	51	56	65	59	40				

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	9	48	43	16	48	45	8				
ELL	32	50	47	51	55	27	24				
BLK	32	64	64	39	55	43	7				
HSP	38	51	48	60	60	43	35				
WHT	49	51	50	66	61	54	57				
FRL	39	53	52	57	58	45	36				
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	6	18	13	19	29	31					
ELL	23	40	48	54	67	56	14				
BLK	15	28		33	22						
HSP	36	47	50	59	66	59	20				
WHT	55	53		63	59	42	48				
FRL	35	44	42	53	56	51	26				

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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science with 43% proficiency. Historically low. Least amount of time devoted per subject. Science scores in 5th grade are directly related to ELA scores from 4th Grade.

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

Lowest Quartile in ELA, which was a -2% from the previous year. Different set of students and large population compared to the year before.

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 Achievement, -11%. Historically low in this category. Working on raising the level of expectation and moving teachers around to different grade levels.

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

Math Lowest 25%. Solid steady teachers, who are experts in their content in 4th and 5th grade, led to the large increase.

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

Student attendance and Level 1's on Math or Reading FSA

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

1. Reading Remediation
2. Attendance
3. Discipline Alternatives to Suspension
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Proficiency
Rationale	Historically low 3rd Grade Reading results.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to raise our 3rd Grader Reading proficiency percentage by 4% to 46% overall. With 3rd Grade moving 4% this year and rigorous instruction at primary levels, we feel that in 2 years we will be at 50% reading level in 3rd Grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group strategy we implemented last year raised the reading proficiency percentage by 4%. Using the same strategies and reading intervention program we felt that 4% this year and 4% the following year is attainable.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small 3rd Grade Reading Classes 2. More Monitoring of achievement 3. Celebrate Small Victories 4. Progress monitoring more frequently 5.
Person Responsible	Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	5th Grade Science Scores
Rationale	Our 5th Grade science scores are historically lowest in the district. That is a direct correlation to the our Reading proficiency from 3rd to 4th grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Currently LCE is at 43% with our science scores and the district is at 45%, while the state is at 53%. With our progress monitoring and STEM lab initiative, we feel that 50% science proficiency is attainable.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dedicated Science Time 2. Science Time is treated just like Math or ELA 3. Highly Qualified teachers in 5th Grade 4. STEM Lab Initiative 5.
Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
#3	
Title	Lowest Quartile in ELA
Rationale	LCE's LQ for ELA is historically been around the 51% mark.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal for this year is to increase the LQ ELA percentage by 4% to 54% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using iReady as a bench mark to determine predicted proficiency and using the 2018-2019 FSA scores as comparison will help us determine the potential for our ELA Growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady time in Labs as part of specials 2. Progress Monitoring of growth and stretch growth goals for each student 3. iReady Lessons utilized to help assist current content 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Lowest Quartile in Math
Rationale	LCE's lowest quartile numbers have fluctuated from a 70% high to a 45% low. Math is the strongest subject at LCE and we feel that we can raise the bar.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal for this year is to increase the LQ ELA percentage by 4% to 63% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using iReady as a bench mark to determine predicted proficiency and using the 2018-2019 FSA scores as comparison will help us determine the potential for our Math Growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady time in Labs as part of specials 2. Progress Monitoring of growth and stretch growth goals for each student 3. iReady Lessons utilized to help assist current content 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@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).

Our school 3rd Grade Reading proficiency is historically low. Our goal is target the lowest 36 students coming from 2nd grade (2018-2019 SY) and place them in a small group environment. We have also placed our highest qualified teachers in 4th and 5th grade in order to maximize growth for those students. We will also target our Black/African American population so that their reading proficiency is no longer below 41%. Our goal is to have our Black/African American Reading proficiency at 41%, while this is the minimum requirement for ESSA subgroups, it is an increase of 6% for that subgroup. Our Reading intervention program is aligned to help meet our goal.

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.

By May 2020, 95% of parents/families will have participated in their child's' education as determined by attendance at parent meetings, workshops and quarterly parent/ teacher conferences. We will be working closely with our community partners to have guest speakers on campus in order to entice students to think about years past elementary. We will be working with LPMS AVID in order to have student leaders and speakers teach our students about the benefits of AVID.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

d. Lake Country ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing monthly class meetings focused on social-emotional skills through our guidance/school counselor; student mentoring programs; and student tutoring programs.

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

To ensure a smooth transition into kindergarten, teachers and administrators from Lake Country Elementary communicate often with the community's early childhood programs. Expectations are communicated back and forth across both levels. Information about the Kindergarten Common Core State Standards is provided to the preschools so they are aware of where students need to be academically when they make the transition. In May, parent meetings are held at the preschools when elementary staff can attend and answer any questions parents have. Each preschool is also invited to bring their 4 year old students to spend a morning in the Kindergarten classrooms in May. Open House is held the week before school starts in August where students can meet their teachers and become comfortable with their surroundings. At the start of the school year, The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) is administered to assess the readiness of each child for kindergarten. LCE also meets with staff from the local middle school LPMS to complete vertical articulation. In May our students visit and tour the school during the school day and LPMS also has a 6th grade orientation night.

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.

Lake Country Elementary utilizes the 4-step problem-solving model to implement and monitor the MTSS and SIP structures:

Step 1: Define, in objective and measurable terms, the goal(s) to be attained (what is it we want students know and be able to do).

Step 2: Identify possible reasons why the desired goal(s) is not being attained.

Step 3: Develop and implement a well-supported plan involving evidence-based strategies to attain the goal(s) (based on data that verified the reasons identified in Step 2).

Step 4: Evaluate the effectiveness of the plan in relation to stated goals.

The MTSS Leadership Team meets on a monthly basis and reviews student data at least four times per year. The MTSS Leadership team also shares graphic visuals of student data with whole staff and individual teachers. The team also monitors and provides support to teachers making instructional changes in the classroom. Through these small group meetings, the team also provides support through problem solving, resources, and mentoring.

Title I, Part A

Will provide funds to all district schools, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of NCLB.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Provides services to migrant students (PreK-12th grade) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, and provide health and guidance services to them. The Migrant Early Childhood Program serves 4 year old children in a full time preschool program, focusing on readiness activities. Parent involvement and education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.

Title I, Part D

Provides services to children who are delinquent or neglected.

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

Leader in Me Program which involves data tracking and goal setting

DEAL (Drop Everything and Lead) which involves students being involved in activities that prepare them for life outside of school.

Guest Speakers

AVID Implementation

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 5th Grade Science Scores	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile in ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest Quartile in Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00