
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://rok.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Ora Whitehead R

Start Date for this Principal: 8/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://rok.dadeschools.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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Grade				D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 mission of Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center is to create an environment that fosters individual students' mastery of life skills through: an integrated academic curriculum, the use technology, a comprehensive behavioral program and therapeutic service encompassing school, family, and community partnerships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school supports students in their quest to maximize academic, social, and behavioral functioning in order for them to become contributing members of society.

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
Whitehead, Ora	Principal	Principal, Ms. Berge-MacInnes: As the school's instructional leader, Ms. Berge-MacInnes provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Berge-MacInnes establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Rubio, Joseph	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Joseph Rubio assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. He ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Lewis, Tuwanna	Other	As an instructor and grade level chair, Ms. Lewis acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Samuel, Khalilah	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor and grade level chair, Mr. Samuel acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Love, Mamie	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor and grade level chair, Ms. Love serves as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.

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	0	0	2	3	7	10	7	13	10	14	14	10	35	125
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	3	5	1	8	9	11	7	9	10	19	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	6	5	3	1	30
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	2	6	5	7	8	6	7	4	0	0	45

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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	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	
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	0%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	14 (0)	14 (0)	10 (0)	35 (0)	125 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)	9 (0)	11 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	10 (0)	19 (0)	83 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	30 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	45 (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	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	18%	60%	-42%	56%	-38%
	2018	17%	59%	-42%	58%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	69%	-69%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	40%	-13%	46%	-19%
	2018	8%	38%	-30%	45%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
	2018	15%	44%	-29%	50%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	15%	65%	-50%	65%	-50%
Compare		-15%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	71%	-53%	70%	-52%
2018	33%	67%	-34%	68%	-35%
Compare		-15%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	35	40	27	51	50	24	35		56	
ELL				40							
BLK	14	22		17	43						
HSP	22	46		31	61		27	50		46	
FRL	22	36	40	28	51	50	25	38		50	
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	21	35	40	27	51	50	24	35		56	
ELL				40							
BLK	14	22		17	43						
HSP	22	46		31	61		27	50		46	
FRL	22	36	40	28	51	50	25	38		50	
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	21	35	40	27	51	50	24	35		56	
ELL				40							
BLK	14	22		17	43						
HSP	22	46		31	61		27	50		46	
FRL	22	36	40	28	51	50	25	38		50	

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	40
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	24
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Algebra I EOC Learning Gains which went from 22% in 2017-2018 22% to 0% in 2018-2019.

Contributing factors : High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences. Many students do not have previous year's data to be able to have a learning gain. Alignment to standards needs improvement.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is ELA Learning Gains which declined by 15 percentage points:

- 2017-2018 41%
- 2018-2019 26%

Contributing factors : High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences. Many students do not have previous year's data to be able to have a learning gain. Alignment to standards needs improvement.

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 data component that had the greatest gap is : Algebra I EOC Proficiency with the following:

- 2018-2019 0 %
- 2017-2018 0 %
- 2016-2017 7% (1 student)

Contributing factors : Only 8 students were assessed. High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is Geometry EOC Learning Gains – 18 percentage points increase

- 2017-2018 26%
- 2018-2019 41%

Contributing factors include: Instruction aligned to pacing guides, use of Math Nation, hands-on activities and teacher made assessments.

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

One potential area of concern indicated by the data is that 83 students had a total of 18 or more absences for the 208-2019 school year.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains for grades 4-10
2. ELA Proficiency for grades 3-10
3. Algebra 1 EOC Learning Gains
4. FSA Math Learning Gains 4-10

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Ongoing Progress Monitoring
Rationale	Given our high number of medically fragile students, this data and area of focus affirms that effective teaching strategies can impact the learning gains of a student with special medical conditions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If students are provided with explicit instruction coupled with on-going progress monitoring, then there will be an increase in learning gains and proficiency in reading at all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ora Whitehead (pr8181@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Gradual Release of Responsibility will be employed in all classrooms, ensuring that all subgroup needs are addressed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Gradual Release of Responsibility is a style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gradual Release of Responsibility Professional development 2. Weekly Common planning 3. Monthly shadowing opportunity 4. Data chats teacher with students and teachers with administrator 5. Monthly progress monitoring
Person Responsible	Ora Whitehead (pr8181@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

At Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center we collaborate and build partnerships with local businesses that serve as our community partners. These partners offer support through donations to our token economy system and various school projects. The community partners also assist us with job shadowing

opportunities so that students may learn skills needed for future employment. Students also have the opportunity to participate in Community Based Vocational Education programs (CBVE) where students can practice the skills needed to transition to the community and independent living. Students participate in community involvement that is fostered through volunteer services at the Homeless Assistance Center, Publix, and Cici's Pizza. Community partners are also part of our Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC), and attend meetings so that they may offer support needed.

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.

Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center uses a school wide behavior system that implements positive behavior strategies that will replace disruptive behaviors and create a safe and supportive environment for students and staff. Every student has a Functional Assessment of Behavior (FAB) and Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) where we can identify the problem behavior and design an individual plan to help overcome the behavior. The BIP ensures a safe and productive environment for all students and adults. Behavioral expectations are clearly posted and continuously discussed. Behavior is monitored through an individualized point sheet that targets each student's Priority Educational Need (PEN). The point sheet corresponds to a school wide 5-Level System. The level system is supported by a token economy, where points are exchanged for reinforcers. Students are provided with small group instruction in social skills, self-advocacy, and self-regulatory behaviors.

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

Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center provides students with a plethora of services by a strong team of teachers as well as a team of highly skilled psychologists, social workers, a counselor, therapist and a school nurse to address student needs that, although are not academic in nature, have a strong impact on student achievement. These services include individual counseling, group counseling, family consultations and support, daily developmental group activities, guidance activities, crisis interventions, academic advisement, art therapy, career/vocational counseling, and assistance from the school nurse to aid students in the administration and/or dispensing of prescribed medication.

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 school leadership team uses a multifaceted process to identify and align resources to meet the needs of students. The team collaborates regarding decisions impacting student performance. Adjustments are made as necessary. The Principal has ultimate responsibility for all budgetary decisions, but input from the members of the leadership team is sought and valued. The assistant principal is assigned to monitor the property control inventory including instructional materials and technology resources to ensure they are allocated to maximize student performance. Most personnel are funded through state and local funds. There are also positions funded through the Federal IDEA Grant. Nutrition Program funds help provide free breakfast to all students school-based students and free or reduced lunch to qualifying students. IDEA funds are used to support Exceptional Education students and programs.

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

All students enrolled at Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center have an individual education plan (IEP) developed, and annually thereafter if the student is still enrolled with us. Transition planning begins at age 14 for students as part of the development of their initial and annual IEPs. In this transition plan, the student provides input on future goals including career, educational and personal goals. The intake specialist goes over this plan, as well as the student's schedule of classes, keeping in mind their chosen academic and career track. Electives are based on the school's course offerings as well as the student's interests. Twelfth graders (seniors) are provided with post secondary information from the school's counselor.

Transition meetings are also held with each graduating student specifically to assist them to prepare for post-secondary endeavors by providing them with information on two- and four- year colleges, universities, vocational and career schools and facilitating access to state vocational rehabilitation services when applicable.

Supporting Secondary School Reform, the Articulation, Transition, and Orientation board rule is in place to increase the percentage of graduating students that pursue and are successful in post-secondary areas of enrichment. Teachers implement lessons which focus on improving personal effectiveness, planning life after high school, surviving after high school and succeeding in post-secondary academic institutions.