Ridgeview Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

http://rve.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Schumacher

Start Date for this Principal: 9/13/2019

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)	98%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

http://rve.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	78%

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	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.

** (The Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP are available in most languages)

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.

Ridgeview 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
Roche, Heather	Principal	
McHugh-Clark, Judi	Assistant Principal	
Millard, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Lyons, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Walker, Erin	Teacher, K-12	
Bodie, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	
Morrison, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Lower quartile interventions, SAC Chair
Schoenfeld, Connie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Bazemore, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Coach
Lockman, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Wade, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Worsdell, Lacey	Teacher, K-12	Lower quartile Interventionist and ITF for MTSS
Macdonald, Gina	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader- Multi-grades

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	58	81	78	74	66	69	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	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		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	70%	65%	57%	72%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	62%	58%	79%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	83%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	70%	63%	78%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	66%	62%	78%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	56%	51%	76%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	65%	53%	74%	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	58 (0)	81 (0)	78 (0)	74 (0)	66 (0)	69 (0)	65 (0)	491 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	16 (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	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	68%	2%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	58%	25%
	2018	77%	62%	15%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	13%					
05	2019	70%	62%	8%	56%	14%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
06	2019	62%	64%	-2%	54%	8%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	52%	16%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	71%	5%	62%	14%
	2018	76%	70%	6%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	69%	23%	64%	28%
	2018	83%	66%	17%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	72%	70%	2%	55%	17%
	2018	86%	68%	18%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	64%	63%	1%	53%	11%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	51	47	52	53	54	61	25				
BLK	52	55	45	55	68	73	50				
HSP	83	60		83	70						
MUL	77	56		86	67						
WHT	71	67	53	76	66	59	56				
FRL	68	60	53	68	64	67	61				

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	49	44	51	51	50	55				
BLK	55	56		63	50	27	40				
HSP	69	61		86	81		60				
MUL	62	71		67	71						
WHT	75	62	54	77	71	69	83				
FRL	68	63	60	71	67	53	69				
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	55	80	80	66	75	69	65				
BLK	64	83		62	79						
HSP	71	80		84	72		100				
MUL	78	69		83	92						
WHT	73	80	83	79	78	73	67				
FRL	65	79	85	73	81	80	73				

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	65
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	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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

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	57
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	74
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	72
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	64
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	63
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.

ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance overall. Lack of use of adopted instructional materials with fidelity. Percent of new teachers, new to RVE and/or teaching. ELA lower quartile was universally lower across all testing grades.

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

Fifth grade Science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. A change in instructional personnel from previous years. Lack of rigorous use of adopted curriculum.

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 Lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance overall. Lack of use of adopted instructional materials with fidelity. ELA lower quartile was universally lower across all testing grades.

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

Math lowest quartile showed the most improvement. The use of approved supplemental materials (MAFS and iReady) led to this improvement, along with completion of our first year using Eureka Math as core.

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

Based on the EWS data, the greatest area of concern is attendance issues as they relate to overall low achievement of the FSA.

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

1. ELA lowest quartile
2. ELA learning gains
3. Science achievement
4. Math learning gains
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase of Learning Gains in Math and ELA
Rationale	Based on the previous years data regarding learning gains. ELA learning gains were at 64% during the 2019 school year. Math learning gains were at 66% during the 2019 school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we have high expectations and use grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase in learning gains across all subject areas in all grade levels. Our goal is to increase learning gains in math and ELA by 1% during the 2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using grade-level appropriate Eureka, MAFS, LAFS and HMH Science text with rigor and fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By using rigorous grade-level appropriate curriculum, we can increase student and teacher capacity to achieve grade-level goals.

Action Step	
Description	1. School-wide Eureka implementation (2nd year) 2. Use of LAFS in grades Kindergarten through sixth grade. 3. Use of MAFS for small group instruction and remediation. 4. Coach - Will provide support to new teachers to RVE. Coach will provide support in intentional planning and data analysis to help guide instruction and small groups. Coach will model lessons and work with teachers in utilizing district provided curriculum with fidelity. 5. Interventionist provides intensive small group interventions to students and monitors the MTSS process to ensure movement through the multi-tiered process, 6. ESE Teacher is used to provide services to ESE students at RVE, 7.Paraprofessionals - will provide support to primary grades by leading Sipps, LLI, and math small groups. 8. Chromebooks will be utilized by students to work on iReady, Achieve3000, Zearn (Eureka online resource) to increase proficiency in reading and math. 9.LAFS - District provided resource to be used to increase rigor and comprehension, LAFS will provide all students with access to grade level text and questioning. 10. MAFS will be utilized to provide students with additional exposure to higher level math concepts and provide supplemental material to support Eureka. Teachers will use during small group instruction as needed. 11. LLI Kits will be utilized to provide small group intensive instruction in reading comprehension 12. SIPPs Kits will be used to provide small group instruction in phonics 13. Novel Sets will be used to support county curriculum and increase reading comprehension strategies 14. Teachers will be provided with professional development and learning opportunities with a focus in literacy and math.
Person Responsible	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Overall Intermediate Achievement in Science
Rationale	Based on last year's FSA data, science proficiency decreased from 75% in 2018 to 60% in 2019.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we have high expectations and use grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase in learning gains in Science. Our goal is to increase proficiency to 65% on the FSA during the 2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have increased scheduled time across all grade levels for Science instruction. Along with the HMH curriculum, we will use a lab-based model of instruction to foster deep engagement and increase Science achievement and accountability.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we have high expectations and use grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase in learning gains in Science.

Action Step	
Description	1. HMH curriculum and HMH digital platform 2. Scheduling increased instructional minutes in all grade levels 3. To increase engagement through investing in materials to foster a hands-on approach laboratory model 4. Science Speedbags and Assessments will be utilized during tutoring to increase student understanding of science concepts 5. Professional development and learning opportunities will be provided to teachers to focus on an increase of science development concepts.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

If we increase teacher capacity to deeply engage students on grade level material, then we will see an increase in learning gains.

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.

The school uses all of the following on a regular basis to inform and involve stakeholders: Parent Portal, Facebook, school website, local newspapers, the school marque and the Parent Link phone system for weekly calls. To decrease absences and tardies, teachers will report chronic absences to the Attendance Team and teachers will contact parents after three absences. SAC meetings will be held throughout the school year to help develop and monitor the progress of the SIP and PFEP. September SAC agenda will be a time for stakeholders to provide feedback into the development of the SIP and PFEP. Another meeting will be held in February to monitor progress and assess future needs. The May SAC meeting will be a review and reflection of the SIP and PFEP. Stakeholder input is welcome at all SAC meetings. Participation is recorded and monitored with the use of sign in sheets and SAC meeting minutes.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Our classrooms are based on the collaborative model where social and emotional components are used. The SIPPS and LLI programs also include this component for identified K-3 students . The guidance counselor and classroom teachers teach weekly lessons in character development related to the 7 Mindsets Program. Identified students will also receive Sanford Harmony interventions to address emotional and behavioral needs. Students in crisis may call upon our guidance counselor, the school social worker, or the school psychologist. We are in the implementation process of a Success Team consisting of school social worker, school guidance counselor, administration and selected teachers to monitor and assist in the social/emotional needs of students.

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

Kindergarten staggered entry, FLKRS Kindergarten testing, K-2 parent meeting and orientation, junior high transitioning activities. Upon entering Ridgeview Elementary, each student is screened to assist the teachers in planning the most appropriate curriculum based on each students' need. FLKRS and BAS are administered to each primary child on a one-on-one basis to determine their probability of initial reading and math success. Data from these screenings will be used to plan daily academic instruction for all students. If students are identified as needing assistance outside of the core curriculum; their names will be given to the SBLT.

Assessments will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year to determine student learning gains and determine the need for changes to the instructional/intervention programs

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.

Title 1 Interventionist, Site Behavior Coach, Administration and Teacher Teams are responsible for baseline data, Foundational Assessments via Progress Monitoring Assessment and Information Management System (Focus), FSA annual testing, Running Records, Performance Matters in 5th Grade science, iReady Diagnostic, Acheive3000, SIPPS, BAS, Clay BUS for behavior, FLKRS. End of Year: FSA. FSAA Alternate Assessment. Title 1 extended day programming and 21st Century after school programming. RVE follows a multi-tiered progression of interventions. This process is monitored by the

Intervention Team Facilitator and Intervention Team. Regular data meetings are held to review student progress and success with interventions.

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

Collaborating with feeder Junior High schools, students are given the opportunity to transition through orientations and tours.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase of Learning Gains in Math and ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Overall Intermediate Achievement in Science	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**