Keystone Heights Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khe.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Turbeville   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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)	99%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khe.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	Yes	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keystone Heights Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Sanders, Melanie	Principal	The principal is responsible for leading instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, talent management through recruiting and retaining highly effective faculty and staff, and building the culture of the school.
Lavin, Corinne	Assistant Principal	assistants the principal in leading instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, talent management through recruiting and retaining highly effective faculty and staff, and building the culture of the school
Gillenwaters, Missy	Teacher, K-12	Title I Lead Teacher, Plan Parent Events, Tutoring Coordinator, Small Group Instruction

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	112	105	122	104	109	139	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	8	9	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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)
40

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/27/2019

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	20	17	6	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	10	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	5	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	20	17	6	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	10	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	5	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	68%	65%	57%	67%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	62%	58%	69%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	65%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	70%	63%	72%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	66%	62%	75%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	56%	51%	66%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	65%	53%	68%	55%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	112 (0)	105 (0)	122 (0)	104 (0)	109 (0)	139 (0)	140 (0)	831 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (7)	0 (20)	0 (17)	0 (6)	4 (12)	5 (15)	3 (14)	12 (91)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	3 (1)	1 (0)	4 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (5)	0 (5)	0 (2)	0 (12)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (11)	4 (10)	4 (14)	3 (16)	11 (51)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	64%	68%	-4%	58%	6%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
	2018	73%	62%	11%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	69%	64%	5%	54%	15%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	71%	4%	62%	13%
	2018	75%	70%	5%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	69%	10%	64%	15%
	2018	74%	66%	8%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	77%	64%	13%	60%	17%
	2018	83%	65%	18%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	88%	70%	18%	55%	33%
	2018	81%	68%	13%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	63%	13%	53%	23%
	2018	78%	64%	14%	55%	23%
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	49	48	42	57	57	54	70				
BLK	47	50		56	69						
HSP	67	57		81	78						
MUL	91			100							
WHT	68	58	49	80	75	67	80				
FRL	65	59	53	74	72	64	75				

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	53	59	55	60	66	77	58				
BLK	58	60		42	40						
HSP	71	75		71	83						
WHT	68	63	52	81	82	84	81				
FRL	63	60	57	75	80	83	78				

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	43	62	66	62	72	61	45				
BLK	50	55		56	82						
HSP	53	64		65	79						
MUL	42	60		92	80						
WHT	69	70	66	72	75	63	69				
FRL	62	66	63	68	73	65	61				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students 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	56
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	71
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	96
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 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	68
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	66
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 ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% showed the lowest overall performance. Over the past several years, we have hovered around 50/55% but dropped to 49% this past year. We struggle to find reasons for this gap, although we suspect an imbalance of intervention time and grade level work was at least partly to blame.

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

Our Math learning gains for the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We had massive gains the year before and they leveled out some this past year. We also had a few teacher changes in upper grades math in order to build capacity. We expected a slight drop.

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.

Our ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% showed the largest gap compared to the state average. We struggle to find reasons for this gap, although we suspect an imbalance of intervention time and grade level work was at least partly to blame.

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

Our overall ELA and Math achievement (proficiency) both improved by one point. We continue to focus on teacher collaboration through common planning and professional learning communities where teachers delve into standards, create common assessments, and assess student work.

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

Attendance and discipline go hand in hand and unfortunately several students with excessive absences also have discipline issues which sometimes merit suspensions. We focus on non-exclusionary discipline practices when possible in order to keep students in class.

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

1. ELA lowest 25th percentile learning gains
2. Overall ELA learning gains
3. ELA proficiency
4. Math lowest 25th percentile learning gains
5. Student social emotional awareness and regulation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	English/ Language Arts Instruction
Rationale	If we increase the quality of small group/ differentiated instruction in ELA classes, our lower quartile students will show more improvement. Our lower quartile students are some of our most fragile learners and they need quality small group instruction based on data and using research based materials.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our ELA lower quartile learning gains were 49% in 18/19. We plan to improve this number to at least 54% in 19/20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction informed by data from iReady/ Achieve 3000 and using evidence based lessons from LAFS, iReady toolbox, Focus (from Curriculum Associates), and Phonics for Reading
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	iReady, Achieve3000, LAFS are all aligned to the state standards.

Action Step

Description	1. Weekly PLC meetings 2. Common planning 3. Data meetings/Data tracking document 4. KHE hires additional paraprofessionals to assist in LLI groups and who assist in small group instructional groups. 5. AR is needed to assist in student engagement. 6. LAFS for 1st grade will be utilized in class to assist with standards to be taught.
Person Responsible	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Social Emotional Awareness and Learning
Rationale	When students are aware and can regulate their own social emotional wellbeing, the school is safer and the overall environment is improved.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	There will be an increase of at least 5% (60) of instances of students completing their Indian Pride sheets (collecting all 6 feathers by exhibiting positive behaviors.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue using our school wide behavior plan based on PBIS (specifically Foundations) principles, CHAMPS in classrooms, and 7 Mindsets schoolwide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our PBIS plan and 7 Mindsets address the 5 Social Emotional Learning competencies as outlined by CASEL.
Action Step	
Description	1.back to school Indian Pride behavior assemblies 2. Indian Pride lesson taught by teachers in the classroom 3. monthly mindset (calendar set by district) 4. Indian 200 Club PBIS program ongoing throughout the year 5. Champs Training for teachers for behavior support in classrooms
Person Responsible	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	STEAM learning
Rationale	Through incorporation of STEAM elements, our students are provided with additional science, technology, arts, engineering and math exposure.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to maintain our 80% math proficiency and 79% proficiency in Science, but striding for a 2% increase in scores from last year's FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue to incorporate STEAM elements into all of our resource classes (including PE, media, technology, STEM, art, music.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Since including STEAM elements into our resources classes, our science and math proficiencies have increased. Math proficiency has improved from 57% in the 14/15 school year to 80% in the 18/19 school year and Science proficiency has improved from 60% in the 14/15 school year to 79% in the 18/19 school year.

Action Step	
Description	1. Resource common planning/ PLC weekly 2. Science & Math vertical PLCs quarterly 3. Chromebooks to assist in schoolwide online instructional paths 4. PearDeck provides high quality academic experiences using technology. 5. We will hire additional resource teacher support on STEM initiatives.
Person Responsible	Melanie Sanders (melanie.sanders@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, § 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.

School administration held a meet and greet and a new student orientation prior to the beginning of school. We also extend an open invitation to all parents and families to join both our Parent Faculty Association as well as the School Advisory Council. SAC committee meets quarterly to discuss our Title 1 program. In the beginning of the year, we discuss our PFEP. We like to get parent input on the events

and everything that we offer at our school and what additional educational events that they may like to see at our school. We meet with SAC throughout the year to discuss how our programs are working and if there is anything else that they see teachers may need to meet the needs of the students. Within our meetings we discuss budget depending on the programs or events that parents would like to see at our school. The teachers in grades 3rd-6th use planners in order to communicate with families while the lower grades use a daily folder. Tuesday folders are sent home to all students each week and contain both communication and graded work. Many of our teachers also use a technology based system for parent communication such as Class Dojo or Remind.

Parent Engagement Events Include: Dads Bring Your Kids to School, Steam Night, Literacy Event, Math Night/Parent Night, Daddy Daughter Dance, Muffins with Mom, Sixth Grade Family Night to work on Science Projects

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.

KHES is fortunate to have two school guidance counselors, two Right Path behavioral services counselors, a school social worker, and various other county based employees who help meet the social-emotional needs of our students on a daily basis. Additionally, our ELA teachers in grades K-5 are implementing the Making Meaning and Being a Writer programs that have a strong social-emotional component. KHES has also launched a parent initiated mentoring program which pairs a community volunteer with a student to develop positive relationship building skills. The 7 Mindsets program is being implemented at our school which is another avenue for encouraging social emotional wellness and learning. We use Early Warning System to decide which students may need to be invited to our Student Success Meetings.

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

All incoming kindergarten students were accessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs. The students were screened prior to the start of school. This helped to assist in the development of classes. We also held an Open House designated for kindergarten parents only before school started. We were able to talk about what their children would be learning in kindergarten and how parents could support learning at home. The Florida Kindergarten Reading Screener (FLKRS) was given in the first 30 days of school. This information allowed kindergarten teachers to know the strengths and weaknesses of their students. Struggling learners were identified and given extra support.
Sixth graders visit the Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High. Guidance counselors discuss required and elective classes. Students complete class selection sheets with their parents at home.

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 a benchmark assessment at least two times per year. School personnel will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. Administrators will meet quarterly with all grade level/content area teams for data meetings. At these meetings, administrators and teachers will look at specific student

data and will initiate Tier 2 or Tier 3 plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level / course expectations. These meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. 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.

All KHE students will experience what jobs are like from our S.T.E.A.M. initiative. (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, Math.) We will set one day out of the year and invite business leaders and community members to present their jobs to our students and show them how school helps them to get where they are today. They will share what type of training they needed to get there as well.
Kindergarten and Pre-K students have a career day and will bring in the fire department and police officers and talk about their different jobs. Teachers will also provide books and talk about other types of jobs that students can be when they grow up. Teachers will encourage a dress up day for students and allow them to dress up what they would like to be when they grow up.